Margaret Carnegie
Library

Mills College Library
Withdrawn

THE BOOK OF DIOGENES LAERTIUS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/bookofdiogenesla0000rich

THE BOOK OF DIOGENES LAERTIUS

Its Spirit and Its Method

BY
RICHARD HOPE

Mills College Library
Withdrawn

NEW YORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1930

Copyright 1930
By Columbia University Press

Published February, 1930

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
THE PLIMPTON PRESS, NORWOOD, MASS.

183.4
D591Xh
54806

PREFACE

This essay is intended to provide an introduction to the book of Diogenes Laertius and an analysis of the thought-pattern underlying its composition. Many of the questions raised by a thoughtful examination of the book have not been included in the study. The nature and scope of the treatment have been determined by the present state of inquiry into the work of Diogenes Laertius and by such items as seemed to call for illumination before the wider and more general problems connected with the work could be taken up effectively.

While the investigation has involved the consideration of details, some of which may appear unimportant in themselves, the conclusions to which these point are fraught with far-reaching implications for the writing of the history of philosophy, especially of Greek philosophy. Because of the dearth of reliable information concerning the historical background of Diogenes Laertius, many of the data presented in his book can be interpreted only in the light of an analysis of the book itself, but it is confidently believed that differences in the construction placed on such considerations will not materially affect the interpretation given of the book as a whole.

The important place which the *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers,* by Diogenes Laertius, has occupied in the history of philosophy is indicated in the testimonies that have been collected to show the reliance that has been placed on Diogenes Laertius and the influence he has had

on the traditional philosophical historiography. The history of Diogenes' book is traced from the time of its composition through the earliest indications of its existence, the manuscript tradition, and the most important printed editions, to the present need of an inquiry into the nature and significance of the work. The problem of the sources used by Diogenes Laertius is treated — in contrast to the viewpoints from which this problem has been approached in the past — in the light of the compilation viewed as a whole. The Laertian conceptions of philosophy as they are revealed in his general observations on philosophy, as well as in his treatments of philosophers, of philosophic schools, of the philosophic life, and of philosophic doctrines, are outlined so far as these conceptions appear to have determined the choice of materials in the composition of the book. Finally, some of the most important results of the analysis are recapitulated, and an attempt is made to evaluate the document as a treatment of Greek philosophy, as a collection of references, as a reflection of the tastes of its original circle of readers, and as a revelation of the mentality of Diogenes Laertius himself.

Still more light would be shed on these as well as on other questions raised by a study of the book if we had a complete critical edition of the document and more definite information concerning the circumstances of its composition. Meanwhile it would be illuminating to compare the types of readers addressed by Diogenes Laertius with such as were addressed in other writings of the period and by analyses of these writings, more or less similar to the analysis offered here, to trace through the period the history of the trends of thought reflected in the Laertian compilation. Such considerations would be proper subjects of separate inquiries which must be reserved for the future.

For the topic of the essay, for the methods employed, and

for many of the contentions made, I am indebted to Dean Woodbridge. The instruction received from him, not only in the classroom, but especially also in many hours of personal consultation, has been a source of unfailing inspiration and delight. To Professor Coss I owe much for his personal interest and encouragement. Valuable suggestions have also been received from Professors Randall and McKeon of the Department of Philosophy, Professor Keyes of the Department of Greek and Latin, Professor Westermann of the Department of History, and Professor Tryon of Union Theological Seminary.

The staff of the Library of Columbia University has cooperated most willingly in the compilation of the bibliography. Grateful acknowledgment is made to the Library of Princeton University for the use of the treatises of Scheurleer, Bahnsch, Gercke, and Gabrielsson, to the Library of Harvard University for the use of the dissertations of Marres and of Egger, to the Library of Yale University for the use of the 1907 edition of Book III of Diogenes Laertius and the translation of Book X by Bignone, to the Library of the University of Chicago for the use of Freudenthal's essay on Albinus, and to the Library of Congress for the use of P. Von der Muehll's *Epicuri Epistulae*.

RICHARD HOPE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
May 16, 1929

CONTENTS

I

THE INFLUENCE OF DIOGENES LAERTIUS

TESTIMONIES 1
The historical importance of Diogenes 1
Estimates collected by Schneider 1
The reliance on Diogenes 3
The precariousness of the history of the book 4

HIS CONTEMPORARIES 4
The life of Diogenes Laertius 4
Theories concerning his dates 5
The dedication of the book 6
The name of the author 7
Provisional date 8

THE EARLIEST REFERENCES 9
The number of references 9
Sopater, Stephanus, Photius 9
Hesychius, Suidas 10
Eustathius, Tzetzes, anthologies 10
Aristippus, Montagnone, Burleigh 11
Summary 12

THE MANUSCRIPTS 12
Critics 12
Description of the manuscripts 13
Interrelations of the manuscripts 18
The state of the manuscript tradition 21

THE PRINTED TEXT 21
Editions and commentaries 21
Critical editions and notes 27
Plans for complete critical editions 29

Varied Appeal of the Book 30
Antiquarian, classical, philological, and critical appeal . . 30
Interest in the epigrams, sayings, and stories 30
Historical and philosophical appeal 31

The History of Philosophy 32
The reason for Diogenes' influence 32
Stanley, Brücker 33
The traditional philosophical historiography 33
The present problem 35

II

HIS SOURCES

The History of the Problem 37
Summary 37
Marres, Rose, Scheurleer, Bahnsch 38
Nietzsche, Freudenthal, Diels 39
Maass, Wilamovitz, Hiller 42
Egger, Rudolph 45
Usener, Volckmann, Gercke, Schmidt 47
Von Gutschmid, Covotti 50
Susemihl, Christ, Leo, Schwartz 51
Arnim, Gabrielsson, Crönert 55
Howald, Delatte, Praechter 57
The need for a new treatment 59

The Number and Variety of the Sources 59
Figures 59
Typical interests reflected 60

The Contents of the References 61
Method of treatment 61
Agreements and disagreements of sources 61
Varied references to typical sources 63
Varied sources of typical references 73
The author's interest in the sources 84

The Problem of the First-hand Sources 85
Method of treatment 85

Statistics 87
Once-quoted sources 91
Interpretation of the data 92

References to the Writings of the Philosophers 93
The fragmentary nature of the references 93
Statistics 93
Plato 94
Aristotle 95
Conclusions from the investigation 96

III

HIS TRIBUTES TO THE EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS

His Conceptions of Philosophy 98
A vital enterprise 98
An educative process 98
A moral influence 102
A tradition to be conserved 105
A product of antiquity 108
A Greek invention 109
A subject for eulogy 112

His Views of Eminence 115
The emphasis on eminence 115
Grounds of fame 116
Types of achievement 118
Marks of honor 121

His Classifications of the Philosophers 122
The eulogistic basis 122
Dogmatists and Skeptics 123
Writers and non-writers 123
Representatives of schools 133

Diogenes Laertius as Encomiast 139
The motive of the book 139
Interpretations of the author's preferences 140
His admiration of Plato and of Epicurus 142

IV

HIS BIOGRAPHIES

THE BIOGRAPHICAL INTERESTS OF DIOGENES 144
The purpose to praise 144
The philosophers emphasized 144
Stories 144
Biographical rubrics 145

THE LIVES OF THE PHILOSOPHERS 146
Birth and descent 146
Place-names 147
Personal names 147
Personal characteristics 148
Marriage 150
Sex-life 151
Social life 152
Friendships and enmities 154
Occupations 155
Wealth and poverty 157
Travels 158
Relations to tyrants 160
Trials 161
Old age 162
Death and burial 163
Epigrams 164
Namesakes 167

DIOGENES LAERTIUS AS BIOGRAPHER 167
Fundamental strains 167
The ideal life 168

V

HIS ACCOUNTS OF PHILOSOPHIC OPINIONS

THE SAYINGS OF THE PHILOSOPHERS 169
The relation of biography to doxography 169
Topics of sayings 169
Types of sayings 171

FORMAL PHILOSOPHIC DOCTRINES 174
The fixation of the doctrines 174
Brief and detailed accounts 175
The divisions of philosophy 175

PHYSICS 176
The praise of physics 176
The eminent physicists 177
Physical doctrines 178
Theology 182
Astronomy 184
Mathematics 186
Medicine 188

ETHICS 188
The praise of ethics 188
The eminent ethicists 188
Ethical doctrines 189
Politics 192

DIALECTIC 193
The praise of dialectic 193
The eminent dialecticians 194
Dialectical doctrines 195
Terms and classifications 197

DIOGENES LAERTIUS AS DOXOGRAPHER 198
The eminent doctrinaires 198
The cataloguing interest 199

VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS BOOK

A TREATMENT OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY 203
The bases for an evaluation 203
The professed aim of the book 203
Its fragmentariness and unreliability 204
Its inadequacy 208

A MINE OF QUOTATIONS FROM LOST WORKS 208
The problem 208
The nature of the references 209
The unsatisfactoriness of the compilation 210

A Product of Tradition 211
The importance of the book 211
Characteristics of the tradition 211
The reinterpretation of Greek philosophy 215

A Reflection of the Original Audience 215
The choice of materials 215
The circle of readers 216
The true nature of the book 217

A Revelation of the Traits of the Author 217
His expressions of his own opinions 217
Indications of his main motives 218
His successes and his failures 220

BIBLIOGRAPHY 223

INDEX 231

Chapter I

THE INFLUENCE OF DIOGENES LAERTIUS

Testimonies

The historical importance of Diogenes. — The *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius has assumed an importance for the history of Greek philosophy that is not easily exaggerated. The authority which this ancient document has succeeded in achieving has been indicated by Yonge in the preface to the translation of Diogenes Laertius in the Bohn Classical Library series: " His work is the chief source of information we possess concerning the history of Greek philosophy and is the foundation of nearly all the modern treatises on that subject, some of the most important of which are little more than translations or amplifications of it." [1] A similar estimate of the place occupied by the work in the history of philosophy has been made by Praechter in Ueberweg-Heinze's *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie:* " Für uns ist die Schrift des Diogenes das Hauptwerk über antike Philosophiegeschichte, und in ihrer Erklärung und Verwertung laufen die Fäden der Forschung zusammen." [2]

Estimates collected by Schneider. — According to the tributes collected in the French edition of Diogenes Laertius published by J. H. Schneider in 1758, that author has given

[1] Yonge, *The Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers by Diogenes Laertius,* 1, 2.

[2] Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 12th ed. (1926), 22.

us an indispensable source book for the history of Greek philosophy which possesses distinct literary merit and marks him as a philosopher of the first rank.[3] "If we did not have it," Morhof is quoted as saying, "we would know little of the ancient philosophers; all who would know their opinions and antiquity cannot pass him by." Without him, according to Jonsius, "we should have only confused ideas of ancient philosophy." "I say it sadly," writes Melchior Canus, "that the lives of the philosophers have been written with more care by Laertius than the lives of the saints have been by Christians." Louis Vivès regards the book as "made with much exactitude and well worth reading." Ménage, Fabricius, Conrigius, and Bruke consider it "very useful although it is not perfect." Maupertius, a contemporary of Schneider, says: "The lives of the ancient philosophers which Diogenes has left us make not only one of the most agreeable of books, they make one of those the reading of which is very useful." John Scaliger calls Diogenes a "very learned author," and Valentin Curio speaks of him as "a philosopher of the first rank."

Besides these eulogies Schneider lists a number of "vain criticisms" against which he defends Diogenes Laertius. Bayle has characterized Laertius as obscure and lacking in judgment; Ménage admits that there are errors of memory and other defects in the book; and Froben, Lips, Sam Parker, Stanley, and Stoll have scored Diogenes for his negligence and lack of judgment. Voss, who eulogized Diogenes Laertius in his book on Greek historians, criticized Keckermann for calling the work of Diogenes a "frigid and languid

[3] The following quotations have been freely translated from the French on pp. 24–27 of the article on the life of Diogenes Laertius at the beginning of the third volume of Schneider's edition in 1758. Nearly all the tributes quoted there are to be found also in the edition of Longolius of 1739, pp. 34–43.

history," which, however, often has its uses. All these faults, Schneider declares, may be found in all ancient authors, and in modern authors as well, not excepting the severest censure, made by Heuman, who " goes so far as to accuse him [Diogenes] of credulity! "

The reliance on Diogenes. — Whatever disparagements Diogenes Laertius has suffered at the hands of his critics have not, however, in any thoroughgoing manner affected the reliance that has been placed upon him as a transmitter of Greek philosophy to modern times. In 1594 Stephanus had compared Diogenes' account of Epicurus with the statements of Cicero on the Epicureans and found Diogenes altogether trustworthy! [4] For Rose in 1866, the book is still " diese als Sammlung in all ihrer Elendigkeit unschätzbare Hauptquelle unsers geschichtlichen Wissens von den Personen der alten Philosophen." [5] According to Egger in 1881, the modern scholars who had then begun to make detailed investigations into the antecedents of Diogenes Laertius had devoted their attention to the book " ut praecipuo nobis de universa Graecorum philosophia thesauro." [6] Schwartz, in the encyclopedia of Pauly-Wissowa, spoke of the text " des für die griechische Philosophie unentbehrlichen Buches." [7] Hicks, in 1925, wrote of the work of Diogenes Laertius that " even when his authority had somewhat waned, sober critics still realized how much treasure was contained in this earthen vessel." [8] And, in the fullest harmony with those who regarded the book of

[4] Edition of Diogenes Laertius by Stephanus (1594), in the epistle to the reader, pp. 7, 8.

[5] Rose, " Die Lücke im Diogenes Laertius und der alte Übersetzer," in *Hermes,* I (1866), 368.

[6] Egger, *Disputatio de Fontibus Diogenis Laertii,* 5.

[7] Schwartz, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* V, 1 (1905), 738–63, *sub* " Diogenes Laertius."

[8] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xi.

Diogenes as indispensable for a knowledge of Greek philosophy, Praechter referred to it in Ueberweg-Heinze as "die rohe, aber durch das in ihr enthaltene Gut kostbare, Kompilation des Diogenes." [9] Accordingly, the consensus of scholarly opinion on Diogenes still seems fittingly expressed in the words written by Richards in 1904: "The man was foolish enough, but the book is of extreme value for the history, especially the literary history, of Greek philosophy." [10]

The precariousness of the history of the book. — The historical importance of the author of the oldest and most influential treatment of Greek philosophy which has come down to us, the opinions that have been formed about him, and the need of endeavoring to place him properly in the history of philosophy call, first of all, for an inquiry into the physical history of his book, upon which so much time and labor have been spent by copyists, editors, printers, commentators, compilers, and scholars. In striking contrast to the high position to which our author has attained, the history of his book has been precarious in the extreme.

His Contemporaries

The life of Diogenes Laertius. — The time when Diogenes Laertius wrote his book cannot be definitely determined. According to Stahr, all that is known of him is that he was "the author of a sort of history of philosophy which alone has brought his name down to posterity." [11] Longolius considers it certain only that Diogenes lived after the birth of Christ and quotes,[12] for the only known incident in the

[9] Ueberweg-Heinze, *op. cit.*, I, 23.

[10] Richards, "Laertiana," in *Classical Review*, XVIII (1904), 340.

[11] Stahr, in Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, p. 1022, *sub* "Diogenes Laertius."

[12] Longolius ed., 12, 14.

life of Diogenes, and that a dubious one, the testimony of Bartholomeus Amantius: "Laertius Diogenes seruauit perpetuum silentium ex eo, quod matri ex eius sermone ac tentatione mors accidisset, nec illum Hadrianus Imperator ad loquendum etiam capitis poena indicta commouere potuit: cuius constantiam admiratus pepercit, et petiuit data ei tabula, ut ad aliquot problemata proposita responderet manu saltem, id quod non grauatim fecit." Different writers have placed the life of Diogenes Laertius in each of the first four centuries of the Christian era.

Theories concerning his dates. — The most complete discussion of the literature concerning the period in which our author may have lived is in an article by Trevissoi in the twelfth volume of the *Rivista di Storia Antica.*[13] According to Trevissoi, Diogenes' book has been dated in various ways: in the principate of Augustus (by Suidas and Alexander Rankabe), because of the comment made in the book (I 21) on the recency of Potamo's Eclectic school; in the principate of Hadrian (by Amanzio, Curio, and Lübker), because Diogenes supposedly cites no author later than Plutarch; in the principate of Marcus Aurelius (by Lips, Voss, and Ménage), because of the mention of Epictetus and Antoninus; in the principate of Commodus (by Reinesius), because of similarities in the book to the *De Theriaco ad Pisonem* attributed to Galen; in the principate of Septimius Severus (by Jonsius, Fabricius, Harles, Groddek, Wackler, Schoel, Klippel, Ficker, Noack, Sophocles, Croiset) or in the principate of Alexander Severus (by Nicolai, Christ, Schwartz, and Zeller), because of the account given of the Skeptics down to Sextus Empiricus and the silence concerning Neo-Platonism; in the principate of Gallienus (by Heuman, Brücker, and others), because of the reference of

[13] Marino Trevissoi, "Diogene Laerzio, L'età in cui visse," in *Rivista di Storia Antica,* XII (1908), 482–505.

Diogenes to the rise of the Eclectic school (I 21); at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century (by Manin), or in the fourth century (by Vismara), or in the principate of Constantine (by Dodwell and Gesner), because of the mention of Empirics who came later than Galen, of Potamo (who was supposedly a pupil of Plotinus), and of Dionysius (who may have been Dionysius Longinus, I 38), as well as because of the appearance, after the book of Diogenes, of a life of Pythagoras by Porphyry and Jamblichus and because of the use made of Diogenes' book by Sopater, who lived under Constantine.

Trevissoi himself eliminated the arguments based on the mention by Diogenes of Dionysius and of Potamo as inconclusive; he accepted the mention of Sextus Empiricus and of Saturninus, the use of the book by Sopater, and the silence concerning Neo-Platonism as valid bases for a tentative dating of the book; and he added that the dedication of Diogenes' book (III 47) to an "ardent Platonist" (as distinguished from the Neo-Platonists) and the ending of the name Laertius in *-ιος* point to the first decade of the third century A.D. as the probable date of the composition of the book. A. E. Taylor supposed [14] that Diogenes Laertius wrote "probably not before the last part of the first century of our era" and added: "The one or two [*sic*] references to the scholar Favorinus of Arles may possibly be later marginal notations by an owner or copier of the text. If they are original they would bring the date of the *Life*" [*scil.*, of Plato] "to the latter part of the second century A.D."

The dedication of the book. — Of the Platonist lady to whom Diogenes appears to have dedicated his book (III 47) Hicks writes: "As to her identity conjecture has, in the general dearth of information about the early years of the third century, proposed no more than two names: an Arria

[14] A. E. Taylor, *Plato, The Man and His Work*, 1, note 1.

mentioned by Galen and the wife of Septimius Severus, the Empress Julia Domna, who died A.D. 217." The book in which Arria was described as a Platonist was the treatise *De Theriaco ad Pisonem* written, according to Casaubon, not by Galen himself, but by a contemporary of Galen. Christ describes Julia Domna as the patroness of Philostratus.[15]

The name of the author. — No more light is shed on the date of the composition of the book of Diogenes Laertius by the name of its author. His name has been given in various forms: as Laertius Diogenes (by Sopater, Suidas, Crönert), as Diogenes Laertius (by Stephanus of Byzantium, the Palatine Anthology, Lambros), as Diogenes (by Stephanus of Byzantium), as Laertius (by Hicks), as Laertes (by Eustathius), as Διογένης ὁ Λαερτιεύς (by Stephanus of Byzantium), and as ὁ Διογενιανός (on the margin of Codex A of Tzetzes).[16] The name Laertius has been interpreted as the name of a Roman family, "one of the members of which," according to Stahr, "is supposed to have been the patron of an ancestor of Diogenes." It has also been explained as derived from a place-name such as Laerte, a village in Caria. In accordance with the latter theory older philologians, according to Schwartz, referred to the author as "Diogenes von Laerte."[17] More recently scholars

[15] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxii; Casaubon, in Huebner, *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium,* I, 149; Christ, *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur,* in Müller, *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 5th ed. (1913), VII, 2, 2, 862. See also Gercke, "Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik," in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Litteratur,* VII (1901), 16.

[16] Hicks, *op. cit.,* xi, xlvi, xlix, li; Schwartz, *op. cit.,* 738; Stahr, *op. cit.,* 1022.

[17] Stahr, *op. cit.,* 1022; Schwartz, *op. cit.,* 738; Zevort, *Diogène de Laërte,* ix. Longolius (*op. cit.,* 7) lists Frobenius, Casaubon, Menagius, Fabricius, and others as favoring the second interpretation.

have interpreted the name of Diogenes Laertius as derived from Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, a Homeric designation for Ulysses.[18] According to Wilamowitz, " nomen Graeci hominis fuisse Diogenem, sed signum Laertium, formatum a Laerta Homerico ut Nestorios Heraclios Platonios innumeraque alia signa, quae aut historia offert aut lapides, qui hisce signis certum tribuunt locum (mox ex. gr. in foro Traiano multa videbis), aut nostra consuetudo: nam Eugenii Georgii Gregorii Stephaniae Hilariae Macariae ex illis saeculis proveniunt. Sed potius Claudii quam Caracallae aetatem, nisi fallor, signum indicat." [19]

Provisional date. — The indications of the period in which Diogenes lived and wrote are thus seen to be inconclusive. In the light of the various considerations that have been urged by writers on Diogenes Laertius, the date of the book has been provisionally fixed by Delatte as between 225 and 250 A.D., and by Hicks as " in the earlier decades of the third century A.D." [20] According to this view, Diogenes Laertius would have been later than such writers as Aulus Gellius, Plutarch, Apuleius, Favorinus, Heliodorus, Numenius, Aenesidemus, Lucian, and Galen; he would have been a contemporary of such writers as Dio Cassius, Pausanias, Athenaeus, Philostratus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian; he would have been somewhat earlier than the Neo-Platonists Ammonius Saccas, Plotinus, and Longinus; and he would have written a century or more before Lactantius, Athanasius, Eusebius, Eunapius, etc.

The book may, however, in view of its use by Sopater, be dated as late as the fourth century, or, if this argument

[18] Longolius ed., 5; Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 738.

[19] Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, " Epistola ad Maassium," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* III (1880), 163.

[20] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce,* 6; Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xii.

may be disregarded, even as late as the sixth century. The earliest known references to Diogenes Laertius, moreover, may indicate that his work was an Eastern book. In the absence of more definite information concerning the time and place of its origin, the document cannot but impress us as though it had come out of a blue sky.

The Earliest References

The number of references. — None of the contemporaries of Diogenes Laertius, so far as known, have in any way referred to him. Indeed, from the sixth century to the period in which our extant manuscripts and the earliest printed editions fall there are scarcely a dozen indications of its existence, not one of which gives convincing evidence that the writers in question have made direct use of Diogenes Laertius.[21]

Sopater, Stephanus, Photius. — Stephanus of Byzantium, a geographical lexicographer of the sixth century, referred to Diogenes Laertius three times in commenting on the Druids, the city of Enetus (from which Myrmex came), and the deme Cholleidae. Diogenes had spoken of the Druids in the *prooemium* of his work; while including Myrmex among the pupils attracted to Stilpo, he had, however, made no mention of the city Enetus; and for the term Χολλειδεύς (as quoted from him) Diogenes had used the form Χολλειδής.[22] Photius, a patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, who revived an interest in the classics, tells us that he had read a work of " various extracts in twelve

[21] Hicks gives the pertinent citations from Stephanus of Byzantium, Suidas, Photius, Eustathius, and Tzetzes on pp. xlvi-li of his edition. Geffcken (*Kaiser Julianus,* 156, 157) claims to have discovered traces of the use of Diogenes Laertius by the Emperor Julian in the propaganda of the latter against the Cynics.

[22] I 1, 6 II 113 III 41.

books by Sopater the Sophist" which the latter had compiled "from the first, fifth, ninth, and tenth books of the lives of philosophers by Laertius Diogenes" and from another source, and Photius proceeds to enumerate some of the categories according to which Diogenes had arranged his materials. This Sopater, whose ἐκλογαί Photius claims to have read, had been a pupil of Jamblichus and had paid with his life for his propaganda on behalf of paganism during the rule of the Emperor Constantine.[23]

Hesychius, Suidas. — Numerous parallel passages to Diogenes Laertius are contained in the Lexicon of Suidas prepared in the tenth century. They appear to have been drawn from extracts made in the ninth century from Hesychius, who had written on illustrious men toward the end of the sixth century. Schwartz and Delatte have stressed the importance of Suidas for the text of Diogenes, and some of the readings in our versions have been adopted from Suidas, since, as is generally supposed, Hesychius may have drawn on the same authorities as had Diogenes. But Delatte asserts that the Scholia of Plato (written about 529 A.D.), which also transmit to us some of the extracts from Hesychius, seem closer to the original than does Suidas.[24]

Eustathius, Tzetzes, anthologies. — Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica about 1175, in his commentary on Homer's Iliad, alluded to Diogenes' use of the word κομπεῖν. Tzetzes, another commentator of the twelfth century, vaguely attributed to "a writer of epigrams" (ἐπιγραμματογράφος) the epigram of Diogenes Laertius on Democritus which he proceeded to quote. This quotation may, however, have been taken from the collection of epigrams which may have been published separately by Diogenes

[23] Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists,* 462–64.

[24] Christ, *op. cit.,* 894 f.; Schwartz, *op. cit.,* 753; Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogene Laërce,* 66 f.

Laertius under the title Πάμμετρος. No less than fifty-six epigrams of Diogenes Laertius found their way into the Palatine Anthology, which was based on a collection of epigrams made by one Constantinus Kephalas at the end of the ninth century and received its name from the Bibliotheca Palatina in Heidelberg where, in the year 1606, the only codex of the Anthology was found and copied out by Salmasius, then a youth of eighteen years. Fourteen epigrams were included in the Planudean Anthology, a shorter collection made by Maximus Planudeus in the fourteenth century.[25]

Aristippus, Montagnone, Burleigh. — In the first half of the fourteenth century the Englishman Walter Burleigh wrote a work *On the Life and Manners of the Philosophers* which was based to some extent on Diogenes Laertius and, according to Rose,[26] was often briefly referred to in library catalogues as Diogenes Laertius. The translation, being more or less literal, has been considered valuable as indicating the kind of manuscripts Burleigh may have had before him. From its greater completeness and better readings and order J. G. Schneider, in an article published in 1818 in *Wolfs Litterarische Analekten*,[27] argued that Burleigh possessed a more complete copy than has come down to us and that the judgment of Diogenes as being a careless collector may therefore be unwarranted as would become manifest if the manuscript used by Burleigh should be found. Nearly fifty years later Valentin Rose, however, called attention [28] to a statement by one Henricus Aristippus in the twelfth century concerning himself to the effect that

[25] Christ, *op. cit.*, VII, 2, 1, 120.

[26] Rose, "Die Lücke im Diogenes Laertius und der alte Übersetzer," in *Hermes*, I (1866), 391.

[27] J. G. Schneider, "Diogenes Laertius und der Engländer Burley," in *Wolfs Litterarische Analekten*, II (1818), 227–55.

[28] Rose, *op. cit.*, I (1866), 387.

he had begun a translation of Diogenes Laertius into Latin, but was drawn away from this task by his Platonic studies. Since the passages of Burleigh based on Diogenes are mainly in the lives of Socrates, Aristippus, Xenophon, and Aristotle the suggestion of Rose seems plausible that Burleigh may have used this translation of Henricus Aristippus as one of his sources and that if a copy of this translation were found it might shed light on the oldest manuscript extant of Diogenes with which it would be contemporaneous. Another source which may have been used by Burleigh, according to Rose, was the *Compendium Morabilium Notabilium* of Hieremias de Montagnone, who died about the year 1300 and whose main interest appears to have been in the moralizing sayings recorded in Aristippus' translation of Diogenes Laertius.[29]

Summary. — Thus from the third century, in which Diogenes Laertius is by some supposed to have lived, to the thirteenth century, and beyond, the notices that we have of his work are scattered, indirect, and meager, and not at all commensurate with the influence it has since wielded on the formation of the history of philosophy.

Manuscripts

Critics. — The history of Diogenes' book appears still more precarious in view of the condition of the manuscripts. Schwartz has rightly seen in the condition of the manuscripts a hindrance to an adequate evaluation of the book.[30] The formation of the text has been influenced down to the present time by the errors made by copyists in the course of the stratification of the various manuscripts and by the

[29] Rose, *op. cit.*, 389, 372. Cf. Heinrich Düntzer, "Bemerkungen zum Caecilius Balbus," in *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, LXXI (1855), 657.

[30] Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 739, 740, 748.

interpolations made by Byzantine and Italian humanists in the manuscripts which were available to them.[31] Before the latter half of the nineteenth century little was known concerning the true state of the manuscript tradition. The critics who have occupied themselves with this question include Cobet, Bonnet, Wachsmuth, Usener, Diels, Martini, Gercke, the editors of the 1907 Basle edition (Breitenbach, Buddenhagen, Debrunner, and F. Von der Muehll), and Delatte. The best descriptions that have been given of the manuscripts are those of Martini and Delatte, of whom the former seems to be the only critic who has had at hand a number of codices sufficient for adequate investigation.[32]

Description of the manuscripts. — It appears that the manuscripts may be divided into two groups, the more ancient codices and the manuscripts of more recent date, the former being represented chiefly by B, F, P, and Φ, and the latter by the so-called Vulgate manuscripts.[33] B (Burbonicus 253), now in the National Library at Naples, is regarded as the oldest and most trustworthy of the manuscripts, dating back to the twelfth (or thirteenth) century. Among other characteristics this manuscript contains many iota-

[31] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxxvi; Schwartz, *op. cit.,* 739.

[32] *Diogenis Laertii Vita Platonis* (Basle, 1907), iii. "Nam et nobis accidit, quod praeter Martinium omnibus qui hucusque de Diogenis libris disputaverunt, ut nec multi codices nec horum omnes lectiones praesto essent." See also Gercke, "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertius," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 405.

[33] The following account of the manuscripts is based on Martini, "Analecta Laertiana," in *Leipziger Studien,* XIX (1899), 69–177; XX (1900), 147–66; Gercke, "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertius," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 401–34; and Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce,* 63–97. Martini dates B as of the twelfth century; V, L (= F), and P as of the thirteenth; Q, W, F (= J), c, z, and b as of the fourteenth; X and Y as of the sixteenth; and the rest of the twenty-eight manuscripts described by him as of the fifteenth century.

cisms, corrections by a second hand, and marginal notes by a third. The original scribe is said to have known no Greek, and while many of the readings seem to be the result of conjectural emendation this manuscript is considered most faithful to the archetype. F (Laurentianus 69,13; rebaptized L by Martini and Bywater), in Florence, is of the thirteenth (or twelfth) century. It is a palimpsest characterized by numerous abbreviations and omissions as well as corrections made by three hands. P (Parisinus 1759) is dated as of the thirteenth (or fourteenth) century and is said to have been once in the possession of Johannes Argyropoulos (†1486), to have been brought to Italy by Janus Laskaris (†1534) and to France by Cardinal Nicolaus Rudolphus (†1550), and to have been corrected by some six different hands. The value of the Parisian codices has been defended against Cobet by Diels. The letter Φ represents a group of three manuscripts of excerpts, supposedly of the thirteenth century and indirectly influenced by some ancestor of F. Extracts of the most extensive of the three, Φ^{v} (Vatican 96; Martini's and P. Von der Muehll's Φ) have been made by P. Von der Muehll, and of the second, Φ^{a} (Dionysius 90, at Mount Athos; P. Von der Muehll's Δ), by Lambros; the third, Φ^{p} (B. N. suppl. gr. 134; P. Von der Muehll's Π), is at Paris.[34] All three of these are supposed to have been derived from a common source, the two last being abbreviated texts. P. Von der Muehll also speaks of a manuscript designated as Ψ (Palatinus Vaticanus 93, anno 1338) which contains the same epitome as Φ.[35]

More numerous are the manuscripts dated later than the thirteenth century. There are, first of all, those which have been copied out of P; namely, Q (Parisinus 1758), of the

[34] Lambros, *Ἀνέκδοτα Ἀπανθίσματα Διογένους τοῦ Λαερτίου* in *Mélange Nicoles,* 639–51.

[35] P. Von der Muehll, *Epicuri Epistulae,* v.

fourteenth, fifteenth, or even sixteenth century, which is said to have been copied out of P by three hands before P had received its most extensive corrections by the third corrector; H (Laurentianus 69, 35), of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, which was copied out of P after the latter had been so corrected; W (Vaticanus 140), of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, containing also writings of Philostratus, Eunapius, and Alciphron; and three codices containing the third book of Diogenes Laertius entire (designated as c, z, and b by Martini, who assigns them to the fourteenth century). Gercke also speaks of a fourth copy of Book III (Marcianus 189, Σ in Plato), in Venice. Out of H in turn were copied the second half (beginning with III 60) of J (Barberinus 1, 21; Martini's F), which together with the first half was corrected according to W on the margin; and also the Angelicanus (Martini's Y), which is dated as of the sixteenth century. Bonnet mentions four codices at Paris besides P and Q; namely, cod. 1405, a paper manuscript of the sixteenth century; cod. 1417, a worthless manuscript giving extracts from Book III; suppl. gr. 83, 28; suppl. gr. 191 f., 194–98.

V (Vaticanus 1302), variously dated as of the thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth century, is regarded by Wachsmuth, Martini, and Gercke as one of the better representatives of the Vulgate group of manuscripts. U (Urbinas 108), of the fifteenth century, agrees in the text of Diogenes Laertius with V and from Book VIII is said to have been indirectly copied out of B. Martini places the supposed predecessor of these two manuscripts in the twelfth century, Gercke not earlier than the fourteenth. D (Burbonicus 252), of the fifteenth century, is said to have been copied or owned by Theodore Antonius of Gaza (Johannes Rhosos of Crete is also mentioned as the copyist). Gercke opposed the contention of Martini that D is dependent upon J. G (Laurentianus 69,

28) of the fifteenth century, differs little from D, both presenting readings not in the ancient codices or in other recent manuscripts and therefore being considered of little value for the construction of the archetype. S (Palatinus 261), of the sixteeenth century, is likewise supposed to be a *gemellus* of D.

T (Urbinas 109), of the second half of the fifteenth century, the one-time possession or work of George Hermonymos, is declared by Martini a worthless mixture produced out of the two branches of the Vulgate and a codex related to F, while Gercke considers it important as a Vulgate of another type than D, meriting a new collation, — an estimate which does not appear justifiable to Delatte since T presents the greater part of the bad readings of F. A (Arundelianus 531), of the fifteenth century, was collated by Thomas Gale and used for the Wetstein edition of Diogenes Laertius as well as by Bywater, along with V, as representatives of the Vulgate manuscripts, for his lives of Heraclitus and of Aristotle. Martini regards A as a copy of P mediated through the interpolated M (Marcianus 393). C (Cantabrigiensis), of the end of the fifteenth century, containing other works besides the first six books of Diogenes, was also collated by Gale and, like A, is not considered by Delatte as worthy of a new collation.

Other manuscripts are K (Vindobonensis 59), I (Marcianus 394), E (Palatinus Vaticanus 182), all containing only Diogenes Laertius; Z, the Raudnitz manuscript, in the library of Prince Lobkowitz; N (Monacensis 159; Wachsmuth's M), of the fourteenth century, written very negligently and containing only portions of the text; O (Ottobonianus 355), containing Diogenes II 74–III 109, besides other writings; R (Parisinus 1405), containing, besides other writings, Diogenes I 1–II 23; Vindobonensis 106, used by Huebner throughout the third book; X (Vaticanus Reginen-

sis 103), of the sixteenth century, the writing of which is judged "puerile" and "rustic" by Martini. Mutschmann also mentions an extract from Plato's διαιρέσεις in Diogenes III 80–109 contained in the Codex Ambros. C 47 sup. in the National Library of Paris.[36] More important is the so-called Codex Aurigalli (f or fr), on which the *editio princeps* of Diogenes Laertius was based and most of the readings of which are thought to have originated from corrections or alterations of the ancient tradition. It was supposed to have perished, but P. Von der Muehll has identified it with Z^3 and says of it: "Pessimum codicem mala fortuna ad summum honorem destinaverat." [37] Nearer the tradition BPF is l, on which the Ambrose translation was based and which has also largely determined the corrections of the text by Cobet. P. Von der Muehll has recently advocated the claims of W (Vaticanus 140) and Co (of the thirteenth century, from the library of Old Seraglio at Constantinople), both of which agree more closely with P than with B, as bases for the reconstruction of the archetype.[38]

Of special interest in the manuscripts is the condition of Book VII, a large part of which seems to have been lost. This omission was indicated in the older manuscripts by blank pages as well as in an index contained in such manuscripts as H, I, and P where twenty names are added to those treated in Book VII in our versions; namely, Zeno of Tarsus, Diogenes, Apollodorus, Boethus, Mnesarchus, Mnesagoras, Nestor, Basilides, Dardanus, Antipater, Heraclides, Sosigenes, Panaetius, Cato (Hecato), Posidonius, Athenodorus, another Athenodorus, another Antipater, Arius, and

[36] Mutschmann, "Vergessenes und Übersehenes," in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift,* XXVIII (1908), 1328.

[37] P. Von der Muehll, *Epicuri Epistulae,* v. Cf. Martini, "Analecta Laertiana," in *Leipziger Studien,* XIX (1899), 152.

[38] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxxv, xxxvi.

Cornutus. The omission of Apollonius Tyrius from this list has been explained by the supposition that he may have been an indirect source for the lists of Diogenes Laertius.[39] Wachsmuth has suggested that Salmasius, whose reference to this omission and index was viewed as a *figmentum* by Meineke, must have had in his hands a codex unknown to us, but Bonnet has shown that the discovery of P, etc., has made this supposition unnecessary.[40]

All the manuscripts known to us are minuscles, and none of them go back farther than from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries. The inference made from some of the readings that they have been derived from an uncial has led to the theory that the common ancestor of our manuscripts is to be dated no later than the ninth century. But while there is general agreement on the lateness and untrustworthiness of all the known manuscripts, the interrelations between them have been variously defined.

Interrelations of the manuscripts. — The first attempt to throw light on this problem, after Bonnet had dealt chiefly with P in 1877, was made by Wachsmuth in his *Sillographi Graeci* (1885). He derived F, B, and P from a common archetype (x), the last of them through a period of alteration (y) which was the common source of P, V, and W. Out of P in turn have come Q and H. Usener, who was interested primarily in the tenth Book, built on this foundation, making use chiefly of F, B, and P for his *Epicurea* and paying only secondary attention to the Vulgate manuscripts. The

[39] Rose, "Die Lücke im Diogenes Laertius und der alte Übersetzer," in *Hermes,* I (1866), 367–97; O. Heine, "Kritische Beiträge zum Siebenten Buche des Laertios Diogenes," in *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie,* XCIX (1869), 611–28.

[40] Wachsmuth, "Ein verschollener (?) Codex des Laertios Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIX (1874), 354 f.; Bonnet, "Die Pariser Handschriften des Laertios Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXXII (1877), 578–90.

conclusion of these scholars, which they shared with Diels, has been generally accepted.[41]

Martini, however, after complete and systematic study of the manuscripts, presented[42] a different tradition based on a rehabilitation of the more recent manuscripts which he constituted into a separate class called α, subdivided into two further groups designated as γ (DF^{a}GS) and δ (OUV). Class β is represented by B only, but has influenced the text of at least the last three Books of class α. In addition there are the mixed manuscripts, P and F and related manuscripts having been derived from β and contaminated by α, and T and other manuscripts having been derived from α and contaminated by β. Martini received the approbation of Drerup,[43] but was charged with faulty methods by Gercke,[44] who denied the existence of β with which α could be compared and defined the real problem as concerning the issue between Usener and Diels on the one hand, who related B and P as against F, and Wachsmuth on the other hand, for whom B, P, and F are each derived from their common archetype independently, Gercke himself preferring the former division. The source of the readings in the Vulgate manuscripts is, according to Gercke, to be sought in alterations of the readings of B, P, and F.

Martini, though modifying his stemma somewhat after this attack, continued to defend his main thesis in a counter-reply[45] on the grounds that *all* manuscripts had to be con-

[41] Diels, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker,* II, 651; *Fragmenta Poetarum Philosophorum Graecorum,* III, 3; *Jenaer Litteraturzeitung,* IV (1877), 394. See also Schwartz on Diogenes Laertius in the Pauly-Wissowa enclyopedia, V, 1, 740.

[42] Martini, "Analecta Laertiana," in *Leipziger Studien,* XIX (1899), 69–177.

[43] *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift,* XIX (1899), 1475–78.

[44] *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung,* XXI (1900), 170–73.

[45] Martini, "Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung des Laertios

sulted and that the relation between the manuscripts is not uniform throughout the ten Books. According to Martini the entire manuscript tradition may be traced to two copies, α and β, of an archetype, x. For the reconstruction of α, VF^1 may be used as *codices puri* (from VI 66 on, only F^1); for β, only B may, in spite of its errors, come into consideration, though F may be cautiously used by way of comparison. In a second study,[46] based on a more extended use of documents than was the first, Gercke again traced BPF to a common archetype, x, the common faults of the two former pointing to a common origin, y; v is to be treated not as a special class, but as influenced sometimes by y, sometimes by F, and sometimes by a corrector of P, and therefore as useless for the reconstruction of the archetype. The relation between the manuscripts BPF is asserted to be the same throughout all ten Books, though this uniformity may not be claimed for the Vulgate manuscripts.

Schwartz, in the Pauly-Wissowa encyclopedia, came to a similar conclusion.[47] If the more recent manuscripts present readings which differ materially from the traditional BPF, these would at any rate be too few to warrant constituting v as a special class; and even the issue between the twofold or threefold grouping of BPF, stressed by Gercke, is treated as irrelevant by Schwartz. The editors of the 1907 Basle edition of Book III derive B from α, P and b from α through β, F from γ, and V from γ through δ, δ showing the influence of α and β. Hesychius is presented by them as closer to the archetype than α or γ.[48] According

---

Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. LV (1900), 612–24; "Analecta Laertiana" (II), in *Leipziger Studien,* XX (1900), 147–76.

[46] Gercke, "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertios," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 401–34.

[47] Schwartz, *op. cit.,* V, 1, 740.

[48] *Diogenis Laertii Vita Platonis* (1907), xv.

to Delatte,[49] B and P represent a better and purer tradition than F, the latter including many conjectural emendations not to be found in the former. Besides these manuscripts, also Φ and Suidas (called Σ) depend upon the archetype. D and G, which afford the best chance to show that the more recent manuscripts may be constituted into a special class, are, like the rest of the manuscripts of this group, without value for the reconstruction of the archetype.

The state of the manuscript tradition. — Thus in the question of the relation of the various manuscripts to each other no conclusion has been reached which has commended itself to all concerned. Little wonder that the Laertian scholars associated with each other in Basle have declared with reference to the manuscript tradition of Diogenes Laertius: "Apparet, quam confusa quamque turbata sit memoria Diogenis, quam qui explicabit nodum paene Gordianum solvisse putandus erit." [50] A solution of the manuscript problem would nevertheless seem fundamental to a proper evaluation of the printed editions of Diogenes Laertius which have appeared in the past as well as of the editions which are expected to appear in the future.

The Printed Text

Editions and commentaries. — The history of the printed text of Diogenes Laertius is opened by a Latin translation prepared by a monk. The interesting monastic figure who played such an important rôle in Laertian lore was Ambrosius Traversarius Camalduensis, so named from the order of Camaldoli which had been founded in 1012 by Romaldinus and of which Ambrose had been made a general. His translation, said to have been first published in Rome without date, must have been completed by 1431, an extant

[49] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce*, 73.

[50] *Diogenis Laertii Vita Platonis* (1907), xviii.

copy (according to Usener and Hicks) being dated February, 1432.[51]

According to his dedicatory epistle to Cosmo de Medici, Ambrose, who had come upon Diogenes Laertius while rummaging among Greek manuscripts, had undertaken his task in response to a demand by scholars and by way of diversion from his religious exercises While seeking to justify his translation of this ancient pagan book of doubtful value, he confesses to the omission of the many epigrams which Diogenes Laertius had embodied in his *Lives* because by provoking laughter on the part of the reader they might detract from the dignity of the history! His feelings were respected until after his death when one Philelphus, who considered the translation a poor one, requested Benedictus Brognolus to add the epigrams to a revised edition of the book. In the following century the editors of the *editio princeps* even expressed the hope that since they had published this ancient document in Greek someone might render the epigrams in the original meter!

From the preface of Brognolus, written in Venice in 1475, it appears that Brognolus had been charged by two Venetian patricians, George Laurentius and Jacob Baduarius, with revising the text of Diogenes Laertius, but that he had found the task beyond his powers because of the poor condition of the manuscripts, so that he had to content himself with preparing a text which made smooth reading, included the verses that had been omitted, but in other respects conformed to the translation of Ambrose. Numerous reprints were made of this translation, especially as the Greek manuscripts became better known; e.g., at Nuremberg in 1476 and 1479, at Venice in 1490, and at Bologna in 1495 (by Jacob Ragazoni).

The first separate portions of the Greek text to be printed

[51] Usener, *Epicurea,* xiv; Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxxii.

were the lives of Aristotle and of Theophrastus in 1497 at Venice with the works of Aristotle by Aldus Manucius Romanus. After that time biographies by Diogenes Laertius were frequently prefixed, according to Longolius,[52] to the works of Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Theophrastus, etc.

The first complete printed edition of Diogenes Laertius in the original Greek was not made until 1533 in Basle. This edition bears on its title-page the mark of the printer Frobenius. In their epistle to the reader Hieronymus Frobenius and Nicolaus Episcopius refer to the Latin translation by "the monk Ambrose" as "iam olim manibus omnium detritum."

In 1566 an edition, prepared on the basis of better manuscripts by Sambucus, appeared at Antwerp. Four years later Stephanus, who seems to have been unaware of this edition, published his first edition of Diogenes Laertius. It was followed by another in 1594 (some, according to Longolius, also spoke of an edition in 1593) and by the Geneva edition of 1615 (or 1616, according to Huebner). These contained, besides the text of Diogenes, the book of Hesychius on the same illustrious philosophers and on other writers, the fragments of the Pythagorean philosophers, and the notes of Isaac Casaubon to Diogenes (prepared in 1583) "enlarged and revised." Stephanus severely criticized the translation of Ambrose as well as the revision of Brognolus, listing numerous examples of mistranslations to the end of Book III. He claims to have consulted eight or nine manuscripts of Diogenes Laertius, in none of which he could find certain of the readings adopted by Ambrose, and he states that he had often found the Latin text exceed the limits of the Greek and the Greek the limits of the Latin.[53]

[52] Longolius ed. (1739), 51.

[53] Stephanus has included the preface of Ambrose and of Brognolus in the edition of 1594, "cum Henrici Stephani de iis iudicio" (*q. v.*).

A Greek and Latin edition of Diogenes with the version and notes of Thomas Aldobrandinus was published posthumously in Rome in 1594, thirty years after the death of this commentator, by his nephew, the Cardinal Peter Aldobrandinus. In the year 1649 Gassendi published his notes to the tenth Book of Diogenes Laertius together with an account of the life of Epicurus, a work which he dedicated to Francis Bacon and which ran into three editions. In 1664 appeared the Pearson edition in London with a Latin translation and the notes of Aldobrandinus, Estienne, the two Casaubons, and Menagius.

The labors of the seventeenth century on Diogenes Laertius found their climax in 1692 in a Greek-Latin variorum edition which had been prepared by Marcus Meibomius and was published by Henry Wetstein in Amsterdam. Besides illustrations of twenty-four of the philosophers, it contained the notes of Isaac Casaubon, Aldobrandinus, Méricus Casaubon, Aegidius Menagius, and Joachim Kühn. By this time the Latin text of Ambrose had been revised, " ut longe plurimis in locis nihil appareat quod Ambrosio tribuere possis." [54] We find in this edition a catalogue of the twenty-four editions of Diogenes that had supposedly appeared before 1663 together with the places where copies of nine of the earliest of them were to be found.[55]

[54] *Studioso Lectori Henricus Wetstenius,* in edition of 1692, p. 1.

[55] Editions: Venice, 1475, Latin; Nuremberg, 1476, 1479; Aristotle, 1495; Theophrastus, 1497; Basle, 1524; Frobenius, Basle, 1531, Greek, also 1533; Cologne, 1542; Venice, 1535, 1545, Italian; Leyden, 1546, 1559, 1585; Antwerp, 1566; Paris, 1585; Stephanus, 1570, 1594, Greek-Latin; Rome, 1594, Greek-Latin, version and notes of Aldobrandinus; Leyden, with the notes of Casaubon, 1595; Lyons, 1602, French, by M. François de Fougerolles; Stephanus, Geneva, 1615; Paris, 1662, with the notes of Menagius; London, 1663, Greek-Latin, with the translation of Aldobrandinus and the commentary of Menagius.

The edition of Longolius, published in Chur in 1739 (Hicks gives the date 1791),[56] was based mainly on that of Wetstein and contains an extended preface, twenty-six illustrations, and an enlarged index. It includes, besides references to the literature on Diogenes Laertius, which had by this time grown to considerable proportions, another list of previous editions, taken from Fabricius and other bibliographical sources.[57] Longolius furnished the basis for a Greek-Latin edition published in Leipsic by John Paul Krauss in 1759 in two volumes, one year after the appearance of a French translation in Amsterdam by J. H. Schneider in three volumes. Zevort in his French translation (Paris, 1847) mentions Schneider's as the only rendition in French extant in

[56] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxxiv.

[57] The mention of a Greek edition by Frobenius in 1531 is declared a common error repeated by Wetstein. As regards the second edition of Stephanus, published in 1594, Fabricius is said to have been imposed upon by others, perhaps also by the catalogue of Wetstein, Longolius not having seen this edition and it being unlikely that Diogenes Laertius would have been published twice with the same notes within two years. For the Antwerp edition of 1566 Menagius had given the date 1556; the edition of 1595 Wetstein had falsely called a Greek-Latin edition; and some lists had contained mistaken references to an edition of 1656 instead of 1663. Editions to be added to the list of Wetstein include: two Latin editions "observed by no one" (Leyden, 1592 and 1596); the notes of Gassendi (Greek and Latin, Paris, 1646; Leyden, 1649, 1675, and in the works of Gassendi, 1658); the edition of Wetstein itself, which is accorded high praise; the comparison of a large part of the life of Epicurus with Lucretius by Obertus Gifani (Leyden, 1695); the life of Diogenes and of Aristippus in Latin by Paul Leopard in Antwerp, 1656; *Varia* translated by Erasmus in his Apothegms; Guilelmus Donaldsonus' collection of *loci communes* (Frankfort, 1625); a French translation by M. B. in Paris, 1668; the life of Aristippus in French by M. le Fevre in an edition of Plutarch's *Lives,* 1668; an English translation "non uno auctore" (London, 1688); a German translation of 1490; and an extant Belgian translation. (Longolius ed., 43–69.)

54806

his day, a previous one of 1668 by Gilles Boileau having been forgotten, and criticizes Schneider for his inaccuracies, Germanic style, and inadequate treatment of the doctrines of the philosophers.[58]

In 1780 the life of Plato in Greek and Latin was placed at the beginning of a twelve volume edition of Plato's works. The *Commentationes Laertianae* of Ignatius Rossius appeared in 1788, having been designed largely to improve the text of Laertius, "quem corruptissimum habemus."[59] Usener also refers to an edition of the tenth Book by Carl Nürnberg, published in Nuremberg in 1791.[60]

For a long time the most used editions of Diogenes Laertius have been those of Huebner in 1828 and of Cobet in 1850. The former gives extensive criticisms, in the preface, of all the principal previous editions, characterizing them as so poorly done, "ut Diogenem in Diogene quaereres," even Wetstein seeming "modo miserandus modo irridendus esse." Extant editions are "few and rare," and only the three of Stephanus are handy to use.[61] The Cobet edition, in the Didot series, was based in part on Huebner, but represents a still more thoroughgoing attempt to free the text from the traditional errors that had come down through the so-called Vulgate manuscripts from the *editio princeps* and to render the "absurd" Latin translation more exact and clear. But while interesting information is given about the manuscripts collated by Cobet in the letters quoted from his correspondence in the *Avis des Éditeurs*, the *Prolegomena* which had been planned have never been written, so that we have no account of the authorities for the extensive changes made in the text.[62]

[58] Zevort, *Diogène de Laerte*, vi.

[59] Rossius, *Commentationes Laertianae*, xxvi.

[60] Usener, *Epicurea*, xiii.

[61] Huebner ed., I, iii–v.

[62] *Avis des Éditeurs*, in Cobet, *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, i–iii.

Among more recent editions may be mentioned the *Editio Stereotypa C. Tauchnitii* (Leipsic, 1895), giving the Greek text only; the German translation of Book X by Kochalsky (1914); the Italian translation of Bignone (1920); the German translation of Apelt in Meiner's *Philosophische Bibliothek* (volume 53; Leipsic, 1921); and the English translations in the Bohn and Loeb series, respectively, the latter "presenting to the reader an eclectic text based largely on the Didot edition."[63] The last two represent the only attempts to render Diogenes Laertius into English, besides the London edition of 1688 by ten translators (each contributing one Book).[64]

Critical editions and notes. — Of special inportance are the critical editions of separate portions of the work. These include: the life of Aristotle, published anonymously, by I. Bywater (Oxford, 1879); *Sillographorum Graecorum Reliquiae,* by C. Wachsmuth (Leipsic, 1885); *Epicurea,* by H. Usener (Leipsic, 1887); the life of Plato, edited by Breitenbach, Buddenhagen, Debrunner, and F. Von der Muehll (Basle, 1907); *Epicuri Epistulae Tres et Ratae Sententiae a Laertio Diogene Seruatae,* edited by P. Von der Muehll (Leipsic, 1922); and A. Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce* (Bruxelles, 1922), in which there are references under the text and the *apparatus criticus,* somewhat after the manner of the 1907 Basle edition, to texts of the ancient authors who treated of the same subjects and presumably used the same sources as did Diogenes Laertius.[65]

Critical notes are to be found scattered also through the

[63] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xxxvii.

[64] Hicks, *op. cit.,* vi.

[65] The need of an edition giving such references had been pointed out by Schwartz (*op. cit.,* 750). Parallel passages to Diogenes Laertius in other ancient authors had also been quoted by commentators, especially by Menagius.

various commentaries and in such works as Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Graeca* (1728), Madvig's *Adversaria Critica* (1871), Cobet's *Variae Lectiones* (1854, 1873) and *Collectaneae Criticae* (1878), Bywater's *Heraclitus* (Oxford, 1877), Pearson's *Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* (1891), Diels's *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1901), *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1903), *Herakleitos von Ephesos* (1909), Arnim's *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (1905), and Mutschmann's *De Divisionibus Quae Vulgo Dicuntur Aristoteleis* (1906). In addition, the results of the criticism of the text of Laertius have been deposited in not a few articles.[66] The relation of all this work to the Laertius problem as a whole has been strikingly expressed in a significant statement of Richards: "I have confined myself mainly to minutiae, with which it seems comparatively safe to deal." [67]

From the knowledge which we have of the career of Diogenes Laertius' book the conclusion appears to be justified that the editions which have been made in the past have been based on inferior manuscripts or at best on a partial use of better manuscripts: e.g., the *editio princeps* on f; Stephanus on M and G; Sambucus on an inconsistent use of the Venetus, Vaticanus, and Borbonicus; Aldobrandinus on the Borbonicus (Huebner: on the Farnesiana); Wetstein on A and C; the notes of Menagius on P and F; the commentary of Rossius on four Vatican codices; Hueb-

[66] G. Roeper, in *Philologus* (I [1846], 652–63; III [1848], 22–65; IX [1854], 1–42; XXX [1870], 557–77); Otto Jahn, in *Philologus* (XXVI [1867], 4; XXVIII [1869], 4); Diels, in *Hermes* (XXIV [1889], 302–25, an account of notes written by Reiske in 1757) and in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* (III [1890], 451–72: "Ein gefälschtes Pythagorasbuch"); John E. B. Mayor, in the *Journal of Philology* (XXIX [1904], 1–23); and H. Richards, in the *Classical Review* (XVIII [1904], 340–46).

[67] Richards, "Laertiana," in *Classical Review,* XVIII (1904), 346.

ner on A and C; and Cobet on F, G, H, and others. While for several portions of the book we have a fair *apparatus criticus* and while the text of the fragments of some of the Greek philosophers has been edited in accordance with the best manuscripts available, the unsatisfactory state of even the best manuscripts we have is revealed in the general judgment expressed by P. Von der Muehll, with particular application to Book X: "Talia sunt subsidia editionis Epicuri. Utinam meliora forent!"[68]

Plans for complete critical editions. — A complete critical edition of Diogenes Laertius, showing the true tradition of the text and presenting in a coherent manner the results of the labors of the commentators, has therefore been long considered a *desideratum*. Such a work was expected to be prepared by Wachsmuth and has since been promised by his pupil Martini, to whom Usener, Diels, and Wachsmuth have entrusted their materials.[69] More recently such an edition has been promised also by P. Von der Muehll, who edited the fragments of Epicurus in 1922.[70] The publication of these complete critical editions is being awaited with mingled feelings, especially in view of the principles defended by Martini, which have not met with the same favor as have the principles previously propounded by Wachsmuth, Usener, and Diels.[71] Meanwhile the *dictum* of Usener still holds true: "igitur ad hunc usque diem Laertii Diogenis lectio omni fundamento caret!"[72]

[68] P. Von der Muehll, *Epicuri Epistulae,* vi.

[69] Gercke, in *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung,* XXI (1900), 170.

[70] P. Von der Muehll, *op. cit.,* iii, iv; Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 12th ed. (1926), 12.

[71] Gercke, in *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung,* XXI (1900), 170–73; "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertius," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 434; Schwartz, *op. cit.,* V, 1, 740.

[72] Usener, *Epicurea,* xvii.

Varied Appeal of the Book

Antiquarian, classical, philological, and critical appeal. — The appeal which the book of Diogenes Laertius has exercised throughout its checkered career has been varied. Julian may have used it in his preparation for his opposition to the Cynics. Sopater may have used it in his pagan propaganda. Lexicographers such as Stephanus of Byzantium and possibly also Suidas may have searched it for materials. Classicists have been attracted to Diogenes as the author of an ancient Greek document; among them Photius in the ninth century, Eustathius, Tzetzes, and Henricus Aristippus in the twelfth, and the humanists in the days of the Renaissance. The first printed editions of the book were intended to satisfy an antiquarian and classical interest. The various editions of separate portions of the book bear witness to a special interest in those respective portions, as does the testimony of P. Von der Muehll to the recent interest in the life of Epicurus.[73] Philologists have discussed the meanings of words, as of the κοχλία with which Amphis compared the frown of Plato,[74] and have concerned themselves with questions of textual criticism. Editors and critics, translators and commentators, printers and publishers have labored for centuries to bring the text nearer to perfection.

Interest in the epigrams, sayings, and stories. — The editors of the Palatine and Planudean Anthologies as well as Meineke, the author of *Comic Poets* (1847), interested themselves in Diogenes' book from the standpoint of collectors. The omission of the epigrams from the first printed translation centered a good deal of attention on the epigrams.

[73] P. Von der Muehll, *op. cit.*, ix.

[74] III 28. Ritter, "Platonica," in *Philologus,* LXVIII (1909), 334 f.; Czebe, "Zu Diog. Laert. III 28 und Alkiphron IV 7," in *Philologus,* LXXV (1919), 178–82.

Richards has testified to the modern interest in the epigrams as well as in the sayings and anecdotes recorded by Diogenes.[75] Montaigne valued Diogenes largely because of the variety to be found in the biographical and doctrinal accounts by that ancient author and expressed the wish that we had a dozen like him or that he were " plus estendu " or " plus entendu." [76]

Concerning the appeal of the stories told by Diogenes Laertius Delatte has said: " Les anecdotes forment la partie la plus vivante et la plus attrayante de l'ouvrage de Diogène. C'etait à elles, apparement, que le public témoignait le plus d'interêt." [77] This interest has been reflected in a striking manner in a review of Diogenes' book in the *New York Times* of April 4, 1926, by J. St. Loe Strachey, who commends the author because he had " a keen eye for a good story," confesses his own delight in " munching Laertius' excellent cheese-biscuits," and finds the book, with its " quick-lunch biography methods," a good " place to dip in in those moods when nothing will serve but snappy dialogue and light anecdote." [78]

Historical and philosophical appeal. — Looking back upon the remarkable history of the book, we may well agree with Zevort, who in 1847 wrote of Diogenes Laertius: " Rheteur sans goût et sans style, epigrammatiste sans esprit, érudit sans profondeur, il a cependant traversé les siècles et trouvé d'illustres interprètes." [79] Nevertheless the *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* still presents to its readers the challenge of an unfinished task, not only

[75] Richards, " Laertiana," in *Classical Weekly,* XVIII (1904), 346.

[76] Montaigne, *Essais* (Villey, Paris, 1922), II, 116.

[77] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce,* 58.

[78] Strachey, " Shirtsleeve Portraits of Greek Philosophers," in the *New York Times,* April 4, 1926, Section 3, pp. 7, 23.

[79] Zevort, *Diogène de Laerte,* iv.

in the way of textual criticism, but also, and that chiefly, with respect to an interpretation of its nature and significance. Unquestionably, the fundamental issue raised by its history and influence, as well as by its very title and professed aim, is the claim that has been made for it, and the use that has been made of it, as a source book for the history of Greek philosophy.[80]

The History of Philosophy

The reason for Diogenes' influence. — That a work with such a dubious career should form the basis of modern histories of Greek philosophy down to the present time may be explained in part by the loss of much of the primary source material in Greek philosophy and by what has been deemed the fortunate preservation of this document, which is the oldest and at the same time the only ancient treatment of Greek philosophy extant that may pretend to any degree of comparative completeness. Thus Zevort, in his French translation of Diogenes' book, finds the only reason for the interest in it to be that Diogenes has preserved what no one else has preserved,[81] and Stahr declares that " consider-

[80] In the editions of Frobenius and Stephanus the title is given as *Λαερτίου Διογένους περὶ βίων, δογμάτων καὶ ἀποφθεγμάτων τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμησάντων.* Codex P has: *Λαερτίου Διογένους βίοι καὶ γνῶμαι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμησάντων καὶ τῶν ἑκάστῃ αἱρέσει ἀρεσκόντων ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ συναγωγή.* At the close of each book many manuscripts have the words: *Λαερτίου Διογένους φιλοσόφων βίων καὶ δογμάτων συναγωγῆς τῶν εἰς ī* (or the proper number of the book). Abbreviated titles are given in the references of other authors: *φιλόσοφος ἱστορία* (Stephanus of Byzantium), *φιλοσόφων βίοι* (Sopater, Suidas), *φιλόσοφοι βίοι* (Photius), *σοφιστῶν βίοι* (Eustathius). (Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 738, 739.) Martini has included the various forms of the title of the book in his description of the respective manuscripts (*Leipziger Studien*, XIX [1899], 69–177).

[81] Zevort, *op. cit.*, iv.

ing the loss of all the numerous and comprehensive works of the ancients in which the history of philosophers and of philosophy was treated either as a whole or in separate portions and a great number of which Diogenes himself had before him, the compilation of Diogenes is of incalculable value to us as a source of information concerning the history of Greek philosophy." [82]

Stanley, Brücker. — In the year 1655 appeared the first history of philosophy of any consequence in the English language, the *History of Philosophy Containing the Lives, Opinions, Actions, and Discourses of the Philosophers of Every Sect,* by Stanley,[83] based largely on Diogenes Laertius. The *Historia Critica Philosophiae* of Johann Jakob Brücker, which appeared nearly a century later, in 1742–44, in five volumes, also followed in the main the lines laid down by Diogenes Laertius.[84] Unlike Stanley, however, Brücker acknowledged his indebtedness to Diogenes in the mingled criticism and tribute: " Debemus ei historiae philosophiae opus, sine magno quidem iudicio corrasum, at immortalis tamen famae, sine eo enim in philosophiae Graecae historia caligaremus." [85]

The traditional philosophical historiography. — Indeed, one may examine treatments of Greek philosophy at random and make the discovery that if the condition of the text of Diogenes Laertius has been such that we must, as an editor has suggested, " search for Diogenes in Diogenes," [86]

[82] Stahr, in Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology,* 1022, *sub* " Diogenes Laertius."

[83] A brief description of this book has been given by Professor Coss in the Columbia *Studies in the History of Ideas,* I (1918), 80.

[84] Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 11th ed. (1920), 43.

[85] Iacobi Bruckeri *Institutiones Historiae Philosophicae,* 3rd ed. (1790), 365.

[86] Huebner ed., v.

it is not difficult to discern the hand of Diogenes in our standard histories of philosophy. After a comparison of Greek philosophy with Oriental philosophies in favor of the former, these treatises usually proceed to Thales and his successors quite in the manner of Diogenes. When the discussions have been stripped of the materials accumulated as the result of the labors of commentators and compilers in the past centuries, stripped also of the few doubts that have been expressed, e.g., concerning the genuineness of the letters of Thales, the basic framework is clearly seen to be that of Diogenes. Thales, e.g., teaches that water is the primary element, predicts an eclipse, gives political advice, founds geometry in Greece, etc. Plato's life is all but identical with that narrated by Diogenes, and his philosophy is still treated as a system composed of physical, dialectical, and ethical doctrines.

The frequency with which Diogenes Laertius is cited by Zeller is an implied acknowledgment of the indebtedness of modern historiographers of Greek philosophy to that ancient author.[87] The use that is made of the Laertian compilation as an important source for the history of Greek philosophy is also exemplified in the collections that have been made of the fragments of the early and some of the later Greek philosophers.[88]

The influence of Diogenes Laertius, not only on the traditional conceptions of Greek philosophy, but also, by way of consequence, on the methodology employed in treatments accorded the history of the philosophy of other periods, is worthy of special study and furnishes proof positive of the importance of the man for the philosophical historiography of the past. Even works that depart from the Laertian mode of approach may nevertheless pay tribute to his in-

[87] Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen.*

[88] See, e.g., Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta,* I, xxx–xliii.

fluence, as when a recent *Story of Philosophy* adapts, as a subtitle, the traditional title of the oldest story of philosophy we have, *The Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers.*[89]

The present problem. — The authority with which the book of Diogenes Laertius has come to be invested and the high regard in which it has come to be held — despite the precariousness of its history: the comparative lack of early references to it, the confused state of its manuscript tradition, and the uncertain condition of its text — warrant and compel an examination of the thought-structure underlying its composition. Such an investigation would seem appropriate, especially since no systematic effort has been made, notwithstanding the time and labor spent upon the book, to show its proper place in the history of ideas.

The question of the reliability of Diogenes Laertius as a transmitter of Greek philosophy to posterity involves the previous question of the presuppositions on which his work was based. Before confidence may be placed in what he tells us about his philosophers it is necessary to learn what he tells about himself. We must endeavor therefore to arrive at an understanding of his own general conceptions as they are revealed in his book. We must seek to trace, at least in an introductory manner and with a view, ultimately, to a fresh appreciation and evaluation of the book, the main indications the author gives us, in his own terms, of his own ideas and inner motivations.

To this end the use which Diogenes Laertius makes of his source materials must be clarified. The points of view from which he regards philosophy and philosophers must become evident. The elements which he selects as important in the lives of the philosophers must be recognized. His manner of treating their opinions must be discerned. The

[89] Durant, *The Story of Philosophy* (published in 1926).

interests of his readers, which it was his purpose to satisfy, must become clear to those who would enter into his spirit, understand his message, and perceive what kind of inspiration he has gained from the grandeur of his theme and how much, or how little, he has caught of the spirit of the old masters in philosophy whom he has undertaken to present to us.

Such an approach to the primer of Greek philosophy composed by Diogenes Laertius will bring the modern reader face to face with one of the most critical occurrences in the history of thought, the transformation of ancient Greek conceptions to suit the mentality and to meet the needs of later generations for whom they would have had little or no appeal in their original form and intent. Such an approach will, moreover, lead to a better understanding, if not of the philosophies of the ancient Greeks and thus of the Hellenic mind, then at least of the philosophy of Diogenes Laertius and thus of the Hellenistic mind.

Chapter II

HIS SOURCES

The History of the Problem

Summary. — Some insight into Diogenes Laertius' ways of working may be gained by a study of his references to other authors. These references have called forth much speculation on the part of modern classicists, in which we have another evidence of the influence of Diogenes Laertius on the history of thought. The reason for the interest of classical scholars in the problem of Diogenes' sources has been stated by Gercke: "Die reichen, und doch so schlecht verarbeiteten, Angaben des Diogenes Laertios sind nicht nur für die Geschichte der Philosophie, sondern auch der Biographie und andrer Zweige der antiken Gelehrsamkeit von allergrösster Bedeutung. Kein Wunder, dass sie immer wieder den Spürsinn der Forscher anreizen, die Primärquellen wie die Fortsetzer und Vermittler, die für das Werk benutzt sind, zu ermitteln."[1]

Yet it is only since a comparatively recent date that the problem of Diogenes' sources has begun to engage the attention of scholars. The principal controversies waged over this question in the nineteenth century were between Nietzsche and Diels, Maass and Wilamowitz, and Usener and Gercke. Nietzsche, Maass, and Usener viewed Diogenes as a copyist of one or two other authors whose identity they believed they had discovered, while Diels and Wilamowitz laid the basis for attempts to reconstruct some

[1] Gercke, "Griechische Litteratur," in Bursian's *Jahresbericht,* CXXIV (1905), 528.

of the main sources mentioned by Diogenes. In the twentieth century Leo, in an extensive treatment of Graeco-Roman biography, analyzed the individual biographies of Diogenes Laertius with a view to determining their respective sources, Schwartz endeavored to define the main problem as consisting in an analysis of the motives back of the legends that form the basis of the biographical tradition in Diogenes Laertius, and Delatte emphasized the variety in the types of references found in Diogenes. Besides these, other writers, from Marres in 1853 to Praechter in the twelfth edition of Ueberweg-Heinze's *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* endeavored to shed light on the problem, either on the basis of one of the established theories or by investigations into more limited aspects of the problem.

Marres, Rose, Scheurleer, Bahnsch. — In 1853 J. L. Marres wrote a dissertation on Favorinus, in which he collected 114 fragments of Favorinus and suggested that Favorinus may have been the principal source of Laertius.[2] In the following year Valentin Rose attempted to base Diogenes Laertius on such writers of the first and second centuries A.D. as Myronianus, Pamphila, Sabinus, Dioscurides, and especially Diocles and Favorinus.[3] In 1858 Scheurleer, treating Demetrius of Magnesia as one of the main sources of Diogenes Laertius, arranged the fragments of that writer alphabetically under sixty-two heads, for forty-five of which he had drawn upon Diogenes Laertius. He had, however, included many references to Demetrius which had not been credited to the Magnesian by Diogenes Laertius himself.[4]

[2] Marres, *Dissertatio de Favorini Arelatensis Vita, Studiis, Scriptis,* 99, 71.

[3] Rose, *De Aristotelis Librorum Ordine et Auctoritate,* 40.

[4] Scheurleer, *Disputatio Philologica de Demetrio Magnete,* 19–120, 7, 10.

More serious attention may properly be paid to the study of Bahnsch in 1868. A comparison of pertinent notes of Diogenes Laertius with the writings of certain of the philosophers and historians cited by Diogenes Laertius resulted in the conclusion that Diogenes Laertius could not have used these writings at first hand. Also the differences in the chronological limitations within which the treatment of the various philosophical schools had been confined, as well as the numerous contradictions and repetitions scattered throughout the work, indicate the superficial manner in which it had been based on previous compilations. According to Bahnsch the sources of Diogenes Laertius consisted, on the one hand, of specialized works dealing with the various philosophical doctrines and successions and, on the other hand, of works of a more encyclopedic nature such as the writings of Favorinus, Myronianus, and Pamphila. Concerning Diocles, Bahnsch was unable to reach any certain conclusion.[5]

Nietzsche, Freudenthal, Diels. — In an article published in 1868 and 1869 Nietzsche declared that, aside from the notes taken from Favorinus, "Laertius est Dioclis ἐπιτομή."[6] From the statement of Diogenes that Diocles "also" gave the logical doctrines of the Stoics in detail (VII 48), Nietzsche argued that the previously cited briefer exposition of those doctrines as well as the account of the divisions of philosophy made by the Stoics had been taken from Diocles. Indeed, the entire discussion of the Stoic, Epicurean, and Cynic doctrines had probably been derived from Diocles as

[5] Bahnsch, *Quaestionum de Diogenis Laertii Fontibus Initia,* 2–22, 24–45, 45–53, 49. Examples of notes of Diogenes Laertius compared with the respective original writings quoted are VIII 83 I 95; examples of contradictions, X 14, 18; 9, 6; examples of repetitiousness, VI 32, 38, 60, 68, 43 VII 10, 6, 15, 29.

[6] Nietzsche, "De Laertii Diogenis fontibus," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIV (1869), 201.

their source. Diocles was therefore the real author of such comments as that concerning the "recency" of the Eclectic school, etc.,[7] and of the catalogues of the writings of the philosophers which are usually given in connection with the doctrines of the various schools. The materials which belonged to a later date than Diocles have been taken from Favorinus, both from the *Miscellaneous History* and the *Memorabilia*, since both of these writings belong to the class of ὑπομνήματα which Diogenes claimed to have used (VIII 53). In another study[8] Nietzsche added Hippobotus as a source for Diogenes Laertius in such passages as the lists of the nine sects and of the sages in the introduction and the doctrines of the hedonistic sects in the second Book. In his *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Kritik des Diogenes Laertius*[9] Nietzsche maintained against Bahnsch that Diogenes Laertius had not used two sources for his presentation of the Stoic dialectic (VII 48), but had copied out Diocles, to whom the use of these two sources as well as the failure to remove discrepancies must therefore be ascribed. As regards Favorinus, Nietzsche found himself in complete agreement with Bahnsch in the opposition to Rose, who had spoken of Favorinus as a main source for Diogenes Laertius. The list of the Skeptics as well as the account of their doctrines Diogenes Laertius had taken from Theodosius[10] or from some unnamed Skeptic.

Among the adherents of Nietzsche's position were Volckmann, Schneider, Rohde, Kern, and Susemihl,[11] though

[7] I 21 VII 160 X 9, etc.

[8] Nietzsche, "Analecta Laertiana," in *Rheinisches Museum*, N. F. XXV (1870), 225.

[9] Nietzsche's *Werke*, XVII, 171–214.

[10] Nietzsche substitutes in IX 79 for καθ' οὓς τίθησιν εἷς πρῶτος the reading καὶ Θεοδόσιος τίθησιν ὧν πρῶτος.

[11] Maass, "De Biographis Graecis Quaestiones Selectae," in *Philologische Untersuchungen*, III (1880), 6; Susemihl, "Zu Diogenes Laertios," in *Rheinisches Museum*, XXVI (1871), 336–41.

Susemihl pointed out such inconsistencies as the explanation by Nietzsche according to which the confusions of Diogenes Laertius concerning the writings of Aeschines were due to the use of three different sources, an explanation which obviously conflicted with the two-sources theory of Nietzsche. Roeper, however, completely rejected the Diocles theory of Nietzsche as "überspannt."[12]

Freudenthal too placed himself in no uncertain opposition to the theory[13] and accused Nietzsche of having failed to distinguish between "Möglichkeit, Wahrscheinlichkeit und Notwendigkeit." The one word καί in VII 48 constituted an inadequate foundation for the theory, especially in view of the variant readings to be found in the passage in question and in view of the way in which the word is used in other passages by Diogenes (VII 4, 5, 6). Nor was Nietzsche warranted in urging the alleged lack of proportion observed by Diogenes since due proportion has been observed by him in the accounts of Zeno, Epicurus, and Plato. The manner in which Diocles is cited to correct the reports of others, moreover, argues for the use of sources other than Diocles in the inclusion of these reports.[14] The formulation of a tenable theory concerning the sources of Diogenes Laertius which would cover all ten Books of the work, Freudenthal found impossible in view of the condition of the text and the little research that had been done in connection with the problem.

Diels, in his epochmaking *Doxographi Graeci,* published in the same year as Freudenthal's study (1879), endeavored to undermine the foundation of Nietzsche's argumentation by interpreting Diogenes' reference to Diocles in the pas-

[12] Roeper, "Zu Laertios Diogenes," in *Philologus,* XXX (1870), 568.

[13] Freudenthal, "Zur Quellenkunde des Laertius Diogenes," in *Hellenistische Studien,* Heft 3, 304–15.

[14] VI 12, 36, 91, 103, 20 II 21 VII 179 IX 61.

sage concerning the detailed exposition of the Stoic logic (VII 48) in accordance with the Ambrose translation, according to which this reference applies to that detailed exposition alone, and not also to the preceding summary account. Moreover, Diels explained Laertius' habit of giving the doctrines first in summary and then in detailed form by the theory that Diogenes used two sources for the accounts of the doctrines of the physical philosophers, both of which had derived from Theophrastus. The first of these sources had been composed in a superficial manner and presented the doctrines in conjunction with striking biographical facts, the latter served Diogenes as a badly needed supplement of the former. The distinction between summary and detailed accounts, then, was a Laertian invention, ostensibly made in the interest of clearness, but really by way of making a virtue of necessity.[15]

Maass, Wilamowitz, Hiller. — In 1880 Maass took for a clue to the discovery of Diogenes' main sources not any one definite statement of Diogenes, as Nietzsche had done, but the characteristics of the possible author of Diogenes' lists of homonyms as they seem to be revealed in those lists.[16] Such comments of Diogenes as that on the continued existence of Epicureanism (X 9) could not well have been taken from Diocles, who flourished about 60 B.C. when the Epicurean school is supposed to have declined, but may well have originated with Diogenes Laertius since there were Epicureans long after they had lost their domicile in the garden in Athens. Nor could the lists of homonyms have been derived from Demetrius of Magnesia, either by Diogenes, as had been supposed by Scheurleer, or by Diocles, as had been supposed by Nietzsche, for Demetrius had writ-

[15] Diels, *Doxographi Graeci,* 161–68.

[16] Maass, "De Biographis Graecis Quaestiones Selectae," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* III (1880), 1–141.

ten of poets and writers and antedated at least eight names[17] in the lists as given by Diogenes Laertius. The lists of namesakes, according to Maass, point to an author who wrote also on eminent men other than writers and philosophers, drew from many sources, collected numerous biographical data, was a rhetorician or sophist, was able to judge the style and genius of poets and writers, had a wide erudition, and flourished between the years 60 and 160 A.D., all of which is true of Favorinus. Favorinus was therefore the more probable author of these lists as well as of all the references in Diogenes' book to the sixteen writers who are cited within those lists. Moreover, the correspondences between Diogenes Laertius and other writers of his general period,[18] who must have drawn from the same sources, indicate that the best parts of Diogenes' biographies, his summary accounts of philosophic doctrines, his quotations, and his lists of books and homonyms have been taken from Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History;* only the detailed account of Stoic doctrines is based on Diocles, of whom not a trace is to be found in the compilers who presented so many correspondences with Diogenes Laertius; some of the stories in Diogenes had been culled from Favorinus' *Memorabilia,* and miscellaneous items from minor sources. The book of Diogenes Laertius therefore appears to be (except in the sections treating of the Skeptics) an epitome of Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History.*

On the pages immediately following the article of Maass,[19] appeared a criticism of it by Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, who charged Maass with having followed the bold methods of Nietzsche. The frequency with which Diogenes Laer-

[17] Maass, *op. cit.,* 28–36.

[18] Maass, *op. cit.,* 45, 46.

[19] Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Epistola ad Maassium," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* III (1880), 142–64.

tius cites Favorinus speaks against Favorinus as the main source from which Diogenes compiled his book, as does the ascription of the reference to the inclusion of Plato's *Republic* in Protagoras' *Controversies* in one passage (III 37) to Aristoxenus and in a later passage (III 57) to Favorinus. Nor is there any passage among those cited by Maass from other writers as offering parallels to Diogenes Laertius which may with certainty be attributed to Favorinus as its original source. Wilamowitz, distinguishing between previous compilations and additions made by Diogenes himself, included among the sources read by Diogenes Laertius about a dozen writers besides Favorinus and Diocles.[20]

In a study of Antigonus of Carystus, published in Volume IV of the *Philologische Untersuchungen,* Wilamowitz sought to lead the entire discussion into new channels. For the investigation of such compilations as the work of Diogenes only two methods appear to be adequate; namely, the method of tracing the origin and development of the legends that have clustered about the popular heroes of the Hellenistic age through their various stages and the method of endeavoring to reconstruct so far as possible the writings as well as the life and times of the individual authors who are known to us only by the references we find to them in what has remained of the Hellenistic literature. This latter method Wilamowitz adopted for his *Antigonos von Karystos.* His study also yielded some conclusions for the sources of Diogenes Laertius, outlined in an *excursus;* namely, that for Books V to X Diogenes used a "Vorlage" which originated about 100 A.D. and which was based on Apollonius of Tyre, supplementing it by Demetrius of Magnesia and Hippobotus; for Book IV, a history of the Academy; for Book III, an elaboration of Thrasyllus differ-

[20] Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *op. cit.,* 154–61.

ing from that used for other Books; for Book II, a contaminated source the basis of which cannot be determined. In addition Stoical doxographies, Epicurean fragments, late Skeptical literature, the writings of Xenophon and of Antisthenes as well as of Diocles and of Favorinus, etc., come into consideration. The conclusions of Wilamowitz are offered with hesitation since compilations of the Laertian type are based on manifold source material, unity is to be found only in the common methods employed by generations of the ancient grammarians, and little can be done to shed more light on the sources of Diogenes Laertius before the appearance of a complete critical edition of his book.

The method of Wilamowitz had been anticipated in part by E. Hiller, writing in 1878 on the supposed literary activity of the seven wise men.[21] Speaking of the bibliographical comments in Diogenes concerning the number of ἔπη they had written, the epigrams upon them, and their songs ("Sinnsprüche," "Spruchlieder"), which are to be found in this order in Diogenes, Hiller refers all these items to Lobon not only as their common source, but as their original author. Lobon may furthermore be credited with the doubtful honor of having elaborated the legend ascribed by Diogenes (I 40) to Anaximenes that the seven wise men had formed a "Dichterkollegium." Little or no credence is therefore to be given these or any other references of Diogenes Laertius to Lobon.

Egger, Rudolph. — In the same year in which Wilamowitz' study of Antigonus appeared (1881), Victor Egger, in a Paris dissertation,[22] endeavored to trace the sources of

[21] Hiller, "Die litterarische Tätigkeit der sieben Weisen," in *Rheinisches Museum*, N. F. XXXIII (1878), 518–29.

[22] Egger, *Disputationis de Fontibus Diogenis Laertii Particulam de Successionibus Philosophorum*, etc., Bordeaux, 1881.

Diogenes Laertius, so far as they were primarily concerned with the successions of the Greek philosophers, from Aristotle to the most recent writers named by Diogenes. Aristotle had employed the method of classifying the doctrines of earlier philosophers according to their resemblances and differences on certain points such as the "principles," etc. Theophrastus had also noted such similarities and differences, but had treated the philosophers in their historical order. His example was not followed, however, by Strato, Lyco, and Demetrius of Phalerum. In his περὶ βίων Heraclides Ponticus "vitae genera physice tractabat,"[23] and the interest in the lives written by Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, Phanias, and Clearchus was chiefly ethical and rhetorical, a historical interest in philosophical successions being manifested only in the treatment of the Pythagoreans by Aristoxenus and of the Socratics by Phanias. Comic poets, historians, rhetoricians, the early Stoics and Epicureans, and other writers furnished additional material for the Alexandrian critics. Callimachus and his disciple Hermippus again made a beginning in arranging the philosophers whom they discussed in temporal order, the former according to the successions of masters and disciples, the latter according to the successions of doctrines. Among the contemporaries of Callimachus and Hermippus were Neanthes and Sphaerus, and the interest in philosophical "schools" in their day prompted the publication of the "testaments" of the early heads of the schools.

More comprehensive work on the successions of the philosophers was done by Sotion (ca. 200), who was followed by his epitomist Heraclides Lembus, Sosicrates, Alexander, Jason, Antisthenes, and Nicias of Nicaea. Jason and Nicias of Nicaea were not quoted on the successions by Diogenes Laertius; Sosicrates, Alexander, and Antisthenes

[23] Egger, *op. cit.*, 12.

were thus quoted by him, but only in passing. The main basis for the outline of the work of Diogenes Laertius according to the successions of the philosophers therefore was the arrangement that had been instituted by Sotion. Other sources must have included Philodemus, Hippobotus, and the writers of particular successions as of the Stoics, Epicureans, Skeptics, etc., as well as more recent writers such as Diocles, Favorinus, and others.

Egger judged Theophrastus and Antisthenes (who followed in the footsteps of Aristotle) as more reliable than the other sources on the physicists before Socrates; Hippobotus and Alexander Polyhistor (who traced the origin of the Pyrrhonean and Stoic doctrines to the Megaric school) as remarkable for the novelties they introduced, especially in connection with the philosophers after Socrates; and Sotion (whose method differed from those of the preceding writers) as the author of an "opus mediocre ac vetustum" which, in spite of the improvements made upon it by Hippobotus and Antisthenes, enjoyed a great authority among the Alexandrian scholars and "semper viguit, ut enchiridion."[24]

An opponent to the method of Wilamowitz was found in Felix Rudolph,[25] who defended the position of Maass and declared that Diogenes copied out not merely the quotations of Favorinus, but also the judgments Favorinus had formed on the basis of them. Contrary to the practise of Aelianus, who cited his authorities "continuo," Diogenes Laertius gave his references in a fragmentary manner, a practice which is at the bottom of the difficulties encountered by inquirers into the references of Diogenes.

Usener, Volckmann, Gercke, Schmidt. — Usener, in his

[24] Egger, *op. cit.*, 76, 77.

[25] Rudolph, "De Fauorino Diogenis Laertii auctore," in *Leipziger Studien,* VII (1884), 126–34.

Epicurea (1887), suggested a different solution of the problem raised by the confused state of Diogenes' work, at least so far as the tenth Book is concerned; namely, that Diogenes may have taken his materials as he found them and given them to scribes to be copied out together with his own insertions. The adequacy of this explanation is questioned, however, by Delatte,[26] at least with regard to the confusions in Book VIII which are said to be similar to those in Book X. In 1892 Usener set forth[27] the theory that for his doxographical résumés Diogenes Laertius employed biographical sources going back to Sotion, for the doctrines of the great schools Diocles, and for supplementary materials Favorinus. Since all the writers on philosophical successions who are known to us are cited throughout the work except the διαδοχοί of Nicias of Nicaea, which was used by Athenaeus, this book, or rather an epitome of it, must have provided the "Unterlage" for Diogenes Laertius. Confirmation of this supposition is sought in the use of such phrases as ὁ Νικαεὺς ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν (IX 109).

Volckmann, besides giving examples for Usener's theory of the origin of the confusions in Diogenes' book, considered Sosicrates to have been the main source for the Introduction and Book I and Lobon for the catalogue of the writings of Timon. In another place he added Favorinus, also for sections in which the name of Favorinus is not mentioned, especially in the life of Aeschines. But according to statements made by Volckmann five years later, Diogenes Laertius was based on Philo of Byblos, as appears from a comparison of Diogenes Laertius with Stephanus of Byzantium.[28]

[26] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce* (1922), 23.

[27] Usener, *Die Unterlage des Diogenes Laertius,* Berlin, 1892.

[28] The three studies of Volckmann published in Jauer in 1890 and in Breslau in 1890 and 1895 were reviewed by Lortzing in Bursian's *Jahresbericht,* XCVI (1899), 185–87.

The conclusions of Usener were rejected by Gercke in his *De Quibusdam Laertii Diogenis Auctoribus* (1899) on the grounds that the reference of Diogenes to Nicias of Nicaea may be variously interpreted and that the confusions in the book may have been due to previous compilations. Gercke followed Freudenthal in the supposition that the book of Diogenes may have been based on the work of a Platonist written between 125 and 145 A.D., which Diogenes may have supplemented by the work of a Skeptic named Hippobotus written about 150 A.D. The tenth Book was based entirely on the work of the former, the praise of Epicurus (X 9) being quoted ironically by the Platonist author (as is evident from the repetition of the word ἀνυπέρβλητος and the use of the word τάχα) to provoke laughter on the part of Platonist readers. Antigonus and Diocles may have been the two principal sources for the work of the Platonist, and it may be possible to reconstruct this work by the methods of Wilamowitz and Usener.[29]

Schmidt, in his study of the polemics of the various philosophic sects,[30] adopted the theory of Gercke which in Schmidt's view is borne out by a study of the prologue of Diogenes Laertius. The successive revivals of the various philosophical schools are said to have colored the philosophical compilations that were made from time to time.

Wilamowitz, on the other hand, viewed all these newer theories as unsatisfactory.[31] He emphasized that Hippobotus must have lived before the second century and that the book of Diogenes Laertius was after all a personal contribution of its author. Especially the theory of Gercke,

[29] Gercke, *De Quibusdam Laertii Diogenis Auctoribus,* 17, 7–10, 68, 50, 66, 26, 32, 3.

[30] Schmidt, *Studia Laertiana,* Bonn, 1906.

[31] Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, "Lesefrüchte," in *Hermes,* XXXIV (1899), 601–39. See p. 632.

who posited a "Doppelgänger" just before Diogenes Laertius, fails as completely as the previous theories which had settled upon Diocles, Favorinus, and Nicias, respectively, as the main source of Diogenes Laertius.

Von Gutschmid, Covotti. — The comments on Diogenes Laertius by Alfred von Gutschmid and by Covotti are representative of more detailed applications of the problem of Diogenes' sources, the former to things Egyptian, the latter to Book VII. The first of these authors, Alfred von Gutschmid, lists[32] eighteen statements of Diogenes Laertius concerning the Egyptians, to which are added thirty incidental references, mainly in the lists of homonyms, to events under the Ptolemies. Von Gutschmid endeavored to ascertain the sources of those references in the first group for which Diogenes does not name any sources. The method followed is that of supplying the name of an author writing either on Egypt or on the history of philosophy whose testimony Diogenes cites with approval or by preference in the context in which the respective passage occurs. Covotti, a Florentine classicist, in an article written in 1895 and published in 1897,[33] ascribed the Stoic physics and the briefer account of the Stoic logic in Diogenes Laertius to Alexander's *Successions* and the Stoic ethics to an ethico-doxographical work which was written about the middle of the first century, was used by Cicero, mentioned Hecato, and treated the Stoic ethics at greater length than it did other ethical systems. Covotti's arguments were based (1) on the similarity in the presentations of the Stoic, Platonic, and Pythagorean doctrines, Diogenes Laertius

[32] Von Gutschmid, "De Aegyptiacis apud Diogenem Laertium Eorumque Fontibus," *Kleine Schriften,* I, 184–200.

[33] Covotti, "Quibus Libris Vitarum in Libro Septimo Scribendo Laertius Usus Fuerit," in *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica,* V (1897), 65–97.

having himself referred the Pythagorean physics to Alexander (VIII 36); (2) on the similarity of the briefer treatment of the Stoic logic to that of the physics; (3) on the correspondences in the treatments of the Stoic ethics by Diogenes Laertius, Stobaeus, Clement, and even Augustine; and (4) on the correspondences in the treatments of other ethical doctrines in these and in other authors.

Susemihl, Christ, Leo, Schwartz. — Susemihl, besides offering comments on matters of detail in separate articles, considered the problem of Diogenes' sources more comprehensively in his study of Alexandrian literature. According to Susemihl, the inclusion of the Cynic Bion among the Academics (IV 46–58) was first made by an Academic writer who wanted to claim Bion for his school. This arrangement may have been due to a confusion of the Academic Crates, who is mentioned as a teacher of Bion, with Xenocrates and with the Cynic Crates. Laertius' chapter on Bion was also based in part on an account that was adverse to Bion.[34] The ascription of the arrangement of the dialogues of Plato in tetralogies to Thrasyllus (III 56), which may go back to Nicias of Nicaea, indicates ignorance concerning the edition of Plato made before Thrasyllus by Derkylleides, an edition which was known to Varro.[35] Susemihl's discussion of the sources of Diogenes in his *Geschichte der Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (1891) is scattered in the footnotes of both volumes of this work and is based for the most part on Wilamowitz.[36]

[34] Susemihl, "Zu den Biographien des Bion und des Pittakos bei Laertios Diogenes," in *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie,* CXLI (1890), 187–91.

[35] Susemihl, "Ueber Thrasyllos, zu Laert. Diog. III 56–62," in *Philologus,* LIV (1895), 567.

[36] Cf., e.g., Susemihl, *Geschichte der Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit,* I, 325 f., 508 (footnote 88), etc. Cf. index (*op. cit.*).

Other general treatments of the literature of antiquity in which the problem of Diogenes' sources has been treated include Christ's *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur,* Leo's *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach Ihrer Litterarischen Form,* and the article by Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Christ supposes [37] that Diogenes used manuals of successions, dogmas, and apothegms, and, of the works supposedly cited by him, chiefly Diocles and Hippobotus, and that he supplemented his main sources by extracts from Pamphila, Athenodorus, Phlegon, Plutarch, Sabinus, Myronianus, and especially Favorinus.

Leo, influenced principally by Wilamowitz, described the work of Diogenes Laertius as based on a previous compilation, which Diogenes Laertius both abbreviated (as appears from the more complete treatments of Hesychius) and supplemented by extracts from Favorinus and Diocles, doxographical materials, and Epicurean fragments.[38] The various biographies of Diogenes were ascribed by Leo to certain authors prominently mentioned by Diogenes in the respective chapters.

Leo traced the historical development of the biographical works which formed the background for Diogenes Laertius and all of which bore the earmarks of secondary products to Peripatetics who had departed from the scientific spirit of Aristotle and yielded to the popular demand for oratorical and literary effect. Already Xenophon, emulating Isocrates, had in his writings given biographical notices of an idealizing and encomiastic type. The founder of the literary biography was Aristoxenus, who instituted the method of telling the story of the life of individuals who had lived

[37] Christ, *op. cit.,* II, 686 f.

[38] Leo, *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach Ihrer Litterarischen Form,* 36, 37.

centuries before on the basis of traditions and combinations of legends, not hesitating to invent descriptions of personal characteristics and to color his accounts by his own feelings of love and hate or religious veneration. The writers from Chamaeleon to Satyrus and Hermippus, including Dicaearchus, Phanias, Hieronymus, Duris, etc., and especially Theopompus, collected anecdotes, descriptions of personal characteristics, etc., largely from the poets and dramatists, and according to the principles of Aristoxenus. Their writings are never quoted under the title of *βίος*, but usually under the names of the individuals treated in them. The founder of the Peripatetic historiography, as distinguished from biography, had been Callisthenes. The historians such as Philochorus, Idomeneus, Neanthes, and some of the biographers wrote on historical periods or on successions of poets, philosophers, etc. Neanthes, the first for whom the title *περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν* is quoted, arranged his biographies according to rubrics and emphasized modes of death.

The chronological and biographical studies of the Alexandrian grammarians were based on the work of the Peripatetics. The transition between the two was effected by Satyrus, Hermippus, and Sotion. Satyrus wrote extensive *βίοι* of poets, orators, philosophers, etc., arranged according to rubrics (inventions, modes of death, writings, etc.), and depending for the most part on the testimonies of poets. His lives were epitomized by Heraclides. Hermippus seems to have supplanted Satyrus in popularity, and in his biographies, which were filled with defamations of character, especially in the accounts of deaths, he studiously gave the appearance, by references to traditions and to the allusions and the textual interpretations of the poets, of having conducted extensive research.[39] Sotion, writing on successions of philosophers, brought his materials into systematic order.

[39] Cf. Diogenes Laertius V 41.

His work, which was also epitomized by Heraclides, appealed to learned rather than to popular tastes. Antigonus of Carystus, while striving for historical accuracy, nevertheless still included anecdotes in his biographies and, according to Suetonius, was to be numbered, along with Hermippus, Satyrus, and Aristoxenus, among those who wrote βίοι ἀνδρῶν rather than περὶ ἀνδρῶν. The basis for less ornate biographies was laid by the πίνακες of Callimachus and the chronology of Eratosthenes. Such biographies often served as introductions to the works of eminent writers. The more scholarly activity of the Alexandrian biographers was initiated by Heraclides, and in the work of Diogenes Laertius, as distinguished from the *Lives of the Sophists* by his contemporary Philostratus, we have a mere compilation of notes and extracts devoid of literary form.

Schwartz, in his article on Diogenes Laertius in Pauly-Wissowa, distinguished from the untenable theories that had been set up concerning the sources of Diogenes Laertius the actual results that had been achieved, not only in the work done on the writings of certain individual authors,[40] but also in the progress made in matters of detail.[41] He credits Diogenes Laertius with the direct use, in passages expressly indicated, of Plutarch, Myronianus, Epictetus, Pamphila, Favorinus, Diocles, and Epicurus.[42] The rest of his material Diogenes took over not from one book, but from various previous compilations. The confused state of the book renders it impossible to restore the original contexts from which the references

[40] Diels and Jacoby on Apollodorus and Sosicrates, Diels on the doxographers, Hiller on Lobon, Freudenthal on Book III, Maass on Diocles and the lists of homonyms, Wilamowitz on Antigonus of Carystus. (Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 741, 742.)

[41] Bahnsch, Wilamowitz, Gercke, and Leo.

[42] Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 741–45.

of Diogenes had been taken, though some information of this nature may be gained from parallel passages in authors who used the same material as did Diogenes Laertius.

Arnim, Gabrielsson, Crönert.—In 1905 Arnim, in the preface to his *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*,[43] suggested that Diogenes' seventh Book was based mainly on Chrysippus' ὑπογραφὴ τοῦ λόγου and an epitome by Posidonius, the former of which had treated the doctrines the Stoics had in common and the latter the opinions of the individual Stoics before Posidonius. This theory was intended to explain the mingling of the opinions of individual Stoics with the common teachings of the Stoics in the account of Diogenes as, e.g., in the sentence (VII 111): "They hold the emotions to be judgments as is stated by Chrysippus in his treatise *On the Passions*." This confusion obtains especially where arguments are cited for the Stoic doctrines, as in the exposition of the interdependence of the virtues (VII 125, 126) where the arguments are those of individual Stoics while the doctrine is that of the school. Only in the detailed statement of the Stoic logic, which is taken from Diocles, is there no such confusion, except in the comments on the standard of truth (VII 54), which may be interpreted as an addition made by Diogenes himself. The account of Diocles seems to have been inserted by Diogenes to supplement Chrysippus, who may have given but a meager treatment of the Stoic logic. From parallels between Diogenes Laertius and other writers on the Stoics it appears that opinions ascribed by Diogenes to individual Stoics are ascribed by other writers to the entire Stoic school or to other Stoic philosophers. Thus the definition of the cosmos referred by Diogenes (VII 138) to Posidonius is referred

[43] Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, xxx–xliii: "De Diogene Laërtio et Ario Didymo."

by Didymus to Chrysippus. A comparison of Diogenes with Didymus seems to indicate that what the two have in common they have taken from Chrysippus' ὑπογραφὴ τοῦ λόγου and that the materials in which there are no parallels between the two authors were taken in the case of Didymus from many sources, in the case of Diogenes from Posidonius.

The year 1906 witnessed a reversion to the bold assumptions of the Favorinus theory by Gabrielsson and a more restrained treatment by Crönert. For the epitome of Nicias, regarded by Usener as the main source of Diogenes Laertius, Gabrielsson sought to substitute the παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία of Favorinus.[44] Through this historical work, Gabrielsson maintains, Diogenes had become acquainted also with the ἀπομνημονεύματα of Favorinus. Both of these works contained comments on the inventions of the philosophers, their trials because of their impieties, their sale into slavery, the genuineness of their writings, etc. "Favorinus hatte einen regen Sinn für das Auffallende, für das Paradoxe, für das Kuriosum."[45] Hence also Favorinus' frequent contrasts between eminence and poverty, youth and age, slaves and tyrants.

Crönert[46] divided the sources of Diogenes Laertius into "Hauptquellen," "Nebenquellen," and "vermittelte Quellen." After a brief description of some of the sources Crönert gives an analysis of the grammatical usages employed by Diogenes Laertius in his references, convinced that the solution of the problem of the sources will depend largely on a knowledge of those usages. The high regard

[44] Gabrielsson, *Über Favorinus und seine παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία*, Leipsic, 1906.

[45] Gabrielsson, *op. cit.*, 49.

[46] Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemus*, 133–47: "Sätze zur Quellenkunde des Diogenes."

of Diogenes for his ancient references, e.g., is indicated in his circumstantial formulas of introduction (II 12), his use of the word ἄρα (II 13), his disinclination to make changes in these references, etc.

Howald, Delatte, Praechter. — A new theory was advocated by Howald,[47] definitely giving up the attempt to trace Diogenes Laertius to any individual known authors and endeavoring to show that Diogenes Laertius took his materials from certain handbooks which were not unlike his own. By collating the references which go together throughout Diogenes Laertius and other compilations, Howald arrived at a threefold classification of the sources, which in his judgment suggested the existence of three manuals designated as A, B, and C, respectively, the names Hippobotus, Pamphila, and Diocles possibly representing late stages in the development of the threefold tradition. After a period of skepticism towards his own findings Howald returned to his original conclusions[48] and supplemented his original investigations by the supposition that A was a compendium written at the beginning of our era. The author of A was probably Areios Didymos, of whom we have extensive fragments in Eusebius and Stobaeus. In its attempt at scientific method manifested in its numerous quotations, A followed the lines laid down by Hermippus and differed from C, in which a more artistic method was employed. B was probably an imitation of A which was made after Satyrus had vainly attempted to supplant the latter with biography of an entertaining variety and after Heraclides had, in his epitome of Satyrus, returned to the use of multifarious references. Nevertheless Howald con-

[47] Howald, "Handbücher als Quellen des Diogenes Laertius," in *Philologus,* LXXIV (1917), 118–30.

[48] Howald, "Das philosophiegeschichtliche Kompendium des Areios Didymos," in *Hermes,* LV (1920), 68–98.

fessed that his theory may be contradicted by the similarities existing between A and C, though he insisted that the appearance of the manual A about the time of the birth of Christ cannot be doubted.

Delatte[49] divided the sources of Diogenes into the more "erudite" and the more "subjective," or into technical works and works of the "imagination." Retaining the distinction between the previous compilations and the additions made by Diogenes Laertius himself, Delatte supposed that Diogenes used directly: Favorinus, Alexander Polyhistor, Apollodorus of Nicaea, Demetrius of Magnesia, Dionysus Halicarnassus, Dioscurides, Diocles, Eubulides, Eumelus, Justus, Myronianus, Pamphila, Plutarch, Sabinus, Philodemus, Istros, and the Skeptical writers cited in Book IX.

In a summary based mainly on the findings of Leo and Wilamowitz, Praechter[50] divided the ancient literature on the history of philosophy so far as that literature grew out of the work of Aristotle into various classes: biographies, histories of philosophic successions, doxographies, and histories of philosophic sects and systems, besides the critical discussions and casual observations of philosophers concerning their predecessors. The interpretation of the relation of Diogenes Laertius to the sources, as given by Praechter, follows that of Schwartz. Praechter, moreover, admits that the method of distinguishing between the materials contributed by Diogenes Laertius himself and the materials that had been compiled before him by others is fraught with uncertainty and that the method of reconstructing the main sources needs further development,

[49] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce,* Bruxelles, 1922.

[50] Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 12th ed. (1926), I, 13–26.

which will depend for its reliability upon a complete critical edition of Diogenes' book.

The need for a new treatment. — A number of important considerations, however, would seem to call for a reopening of the entire question from a point of view shedding light, if not on the many sources used, then at least on the man using them and on the way in which they are used. First, more account might be taken of the actual number and variety of the sources, most of the attention in the past having been centered on the sources designated by Delatte as the more "erudite." Again, inquiry might be made into the kinds of materials selected from the sources by Diogenes Laertius, especially in view of the attempts that have been made, largely on the basis of Diogenes' references, to reconstruct those sources. Moreover, the frequency with which Diogenes gives his references might be noted and contrasted with the number of instances in which such citations are absent when they would have been appropriate, with a view to discovering whether Diogenes actually had before him any of the works quoted by him, so far as this information can be gained from his book. Finally, the question might be raised: What conception of the classic Greek philosophers and of their works is given us in the direct references of Diogenes Laertius to the works of these philosophers?

The Number and Variety of the Sources

Figures. — Even the most casual reader cannot help being impressed by the astounding number and variety of sources cited in the work of Diogenes Laertius. There are no less than 1,186 explicit references to 250 authors. Books given as sources number 365; sixty-six authors, to whom there are 150 references, are cited by name only; and in a total

of 372 references seventy-seven authors are referred to now by name only, now by book-titles.[51] Of anonymous references there are more than 350 in Diogenes' book. They are introduced by such phrases as ἔνιοί φασιν, φασίν, κατά τινας, etc.[52] Of the writings the titles of which are directly given, sixty-two biographical titles are cited 137 times, seventy-two doctrinal titles 111 times, thirty-five general philosophical titles seventy-two times, thirty-eight poetic and dramatic titles seventy-five times, twenty-seven historical and chronological titles 117 times, and sixteen documentary and similar titles thirty-six times, whereas nine religious titles are cited fourteen times, seven rhetorical titles seven times, five educational titles five times, two astronomical titles five times, two mathematical titles three times, etc.

Typical interests reflected. — While a characterization of a large number of Diogenes' sources, and consequently an adequate classification of his references, is at best difficult to give, the breadth of interests they reflect seems to warrant the inference that Diogenes Laertius did not address his book to an audience of scholars with technical philosophical interests, but rather made his appeal to philosophical amateurs and dilettantes with general cultural interests. The dedication of the work to a lady described as an ardent Platonist (III 47) seems to be in harmony with this supposition, as does Diogenes' characterization of his book as an "introductory handbook" (VII 48). The modern scholars who in their investigations have stressed the so-called more "erudite" sources of Diogenes have reflected modern techni-

[51] The *Index Fontium* of Hicks gives three references which are not to be found in the text of Hicks; namely, Dionysius (VIII 46), Democritus (X 4), and Aristotle (X 27). No less than 171 references were not indexed in this edition.

[52] I 1, 6, 16, 26, 105 II 59 V 34 IX 12, etc.

cal interests in philology or philosophy rather than the interests of Diogenes himself or of his readers.

The Contents of the References

Method of treatment. — Not only the kinds of writings cited by Diogenes, but especially also the ways in which they have been used in his book, justify the assumption that Diogenes intended his book to be a popular manual of philosophy. The superficial manner in which Diogenes has reduced the various kinds of subject matter on which his authorities had written to the barest elements is apparent at the points where he has multiplied his references, in the kinds of materials he has selected from his sources, and in the various types of sources to which he has attributed data of the same class.

Agreements and disagreements of sources. — Signs are not wanting that Diogenes found the mass of material before him troublesome to handle or that it had come to him in a confused state. The sources quoted by him seem at times to have proved untrustworthy and were frequently at variance with one another so that Diogenes often found it necessary meticulously to note the agreements and disagreements between his sources. Such cumulative references are especially frequent in Book I (on the sages) and occur but three times in Book IV (on the Academics, IV 4, 7, 38). The name of Hermippus occurs in conjunction with other writers twenty-three times, most frequently with the names of Heraclides[53] and of Hippobotus.[54] Another noteworthy combination is that of Favorinus and Aristotle.[55]

Confirmation is sought by Diogenes from various sources for the tradition of the meetings of the sages, the account

[53] II 143 VIII 39, 51, 51, 67 IX 27.
[54] I 41 V 90 VIII 51, 67 IX 4. [55] II 19 III 48 V 21 VIII 67.

of Plato's birth and of his weak voice, the teachings of ancient philosophers, the fame of various philosophers, etc.[56] The disagreements noted by Diogenes had arisen because different authors had ascribed to different persons certain sayings,[57] achievements,[58] writings,[59] or experiences;[60] different names had been included in different lists;[61] discrepancies had occurred in crediting philosophers with their writings;[62] different accounts had been given of the pupils of the philosophers;[63] philosophic teachings had been variously interpreted or had given rise to conflicts;[64] the sayings of philosophers had been reported in various forms;[65] and the stories told about them had received many alterations.[66] Also important biographical facts had been handed down in different versions. There were differences in the names of parents and ancestors,[67] in the names of birthplaces,[68] in the accounts of personal details,[69] in the narratives of the trials[70] and of the deaths[71] of the philosophers,

[56] I 40 — III 1, 5 — I 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24 II 10, etc. — I 23, 84, 88 II 113 VI 14 — I 8, 102 II 19 VII 34 IX 20, etc.

[57] I 33, 41, 117 II 35, 67, 76, 78, 79, 82, 103 V 18 VI 25, 32, 36, 59 VII 5, 23, 27.

[58] I 25 III 48 VI 13 VIII 3, 49, 85 IX 23, 29.

[59] II 105 IV 24.

[60] I 28, 29, 30, 82 VI 91.

[61] I 16, 19 III 46 VIII 82.

[62] I 16, 23 II 57, 84 III 61 IV 32 VI 80 VIII 57 IX 2.

[63] II 113 III 46 VII 2 VIII 56 IX 5, 18, 34, 58, 115 X 13.

[64] Stoics, Pythagoreans, Skeptics, etc.

[65] I 76 II 77, 78 V 78 VI 36.

[66] III 20 IV 7, 38 VI 20 VIII 89 IX 39 X 2.

[67] I 82, 109 II 60 IV 62 VIII 51, 79 IX 1, 18, 34, 50 X 22.

[68] I 22, 42, 74, 107, 119 VI 84 VIII 1, IX 30, 34.

[69] III 4 IX 35 II 125, 52, 26 V 3 VIII 42.

[70] II 12, 38, 60 IX 54.

[71] I 5, 102, 118 II 144 V 90 VI 76, 79 VII 31 VIII 39, 67 IX 3, 26 X 15.

and in the chronology of their lives [72] and of their deaths.[73] Naturally the effect of citing the various sources which agreed or disagreed on certain points was such as to emphasize the points so singled out, and the general nature of these items is a significant revelation of the types of considerations regarded as important by Diogenes or by his readers.

Varied references to typical sources. — This impression is confirmed, and Diogenes' use of his sources is made still clearer, by a comparison of the types of writings he has quoted with the different kinds of materials he has selected from them and, conversely, by a comparison of the kinds of materials he has collected with the different types of sources from which he has gathered them. The first of these methods ought to give a fair conception of the extent to which Diogenes' references may be considered typical of the contents of the sources mentioned in his book, and the second of these methods ought to shed considerable light on the judgment of Diogenes concerning the evidential value of the different kinds of books to the testimony of which he has appealed.

Perhaps the most striking instances yielded by a comparison of the different kinds of materials referred by Diogenes to similar types of sources are to be found in the quotations from the comic poets. The comic poets furnished Diogenes Laertius with biographical data such as the birth of Protagoras at Teos, for which Eupolis' *Flatterers* is the only evidence! [74] They gave information on the doctrines and achievements of the philosophers as, e.g., Callimachus on the astronomical discoveries of Thales.[75] They shed light on the various schools of philosophy; e.g., on the fame of the Stoics, the customs of the Pythagoreans, and the name

[72] I 2, 38, 68 V 6 IX 41, 57.
[73] I 111 II 44 III 2 VII 28 VIII 44, 67 IX 56.
[74] IX 50 VI 76 II 28 VI 93 VII 27 II 140 VIII 86, etc.
[75] I 25 II 108 VII 30, etc.

of the Academy.[76] They helped to characterize the works of writers; e.g., the dependence of Euripides on Socrates and the style of Polemo and of Sophocles.[77] Being mentioned by comic poets conferred distinction; even their ridicule was worthy of being incorporated in biographies in testimony of such distinction.[78] Hence Plato, against whom no less than fourteen comic poets directed their shafts (III 26–28, 7), stood out most prominently. Especially Timon, the author of the *Silli,* was cited by Diogenes for his commendations,[79] his jibes,[80] and his statements of facts[81] and of doctrines.[82]

To "Aristoxenus the musician" are attributed the statements that Heraclides composed tragedies and that Pythagoras first introduced weights and measures into Greece.[83] Works on painting mention namesakes of the philosophers,[84] Duris being cited as a historian for personal circumstances of the philosophers.[85] Speeches and oratorical writings are sometimes adduced as evidence; e.g., a speech of Lysias for laws of Draco and of Solon.[86] Theopompus' Θαυμάσια is authority for predictions made by Epimenides and by Pherecydes, praises Antisthenes alone among the Socratics, and tells of the honors paid to Plato at the latter's death.[87] From religious books we learn of the birthplace of Empedocles and the religious views of Theodorus, Protagoras,

[76] VI 14 VIII 38 III 7.
[77] II 18 IV 18, 20.
[78] I 11, 89 II 120, 126 VI 83, 87, 93 VII 27.
[79] I 34 II 62 IX 18, 25, 40, 115, etc.
[80] II 55, 66, 107, 126 IV 67 V 11 VI 18 VII 16 IX 115 X 3, etc.
[81] II 19 IX 65, 110, etc.
[82] IX 105, 107, etc.
[83] V 92 VIII 14.
[84] I 32 IV 18 II 104, 104.
[85] I 22, 74, 82, 89 II 19.
[86] I 55 II 52 IX 37, 15.
[87] I 115, 117 VI 14 III 40.

and the Stoics.[88] Books on education are made to tell of the descent of the Gymnosophists from the Magi, the exile of Diogenes, the esoteric doctrines of Pythagoras, and the invention of the shoulder-pad.[89]

A work on mathematics gives the date of the Magians and another the story of the discovery of the Pythagorean proposition, the latter being the only information on mathematics attributed to a mathematical source, and that introduced for dramatic purposes![90] Heraclides' book on diseases is surety that Empedocles was a physician and diviner of illustrious family and that he furnished Pausanias with the facts about a woman in a trance (VIII 51, 65). From a history of astronomy we learn that Thales was the first to study astronomy, and only the astronomical works of Posidonius give a few astronomical explanations.[91]

The principal historical works cited by Diogenes are Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History* and his *Memorabilia.* Diogenes drew on Favorinus, whom he seemed to regard as a Skeptic (IX 87), for references to biographical incidents,[92] pioneer achievements,[93] writings,[94] trials, speeches, recitations, sayings, personal appearance, and namesakes.[95]

Of peculiar interest are the chronological notes of Diogenes.[96] The principal chronological work referred to by

[88] VIII 54 II 97 IX 51 VII 138, 148, etc.

[89] I 9 VI 75 VIII 15 IX 53.

[90] I 2, 25 VIII 12.

[91] I 23 VII 135, 138, 144, 152.

[92] II 23 III 3, 20, 25, 40 IV 54, 63 V 41, 76, 76, 77 VI 89 VIII 12, 15, 53, 90 IX 20, 34, 50.

[93] II 1, 11, 20 III 24, 48 V 9 VIII 12, 47, 48, 83 IX 23, 23, 29.

[94] II 11 III 37, 48, 57, 62 IV 5 VI 73 VIII 63, 83.

[95] II 38, 40 III 19 V 6 — II 20, 39 V 9 — III 37 VIII 63 — V 9, 21 VI 25 — VIII 73 — I 79.

[96] This subject is treated *in extenso* at this place in the interest of convenience of reference.

him is that of Apollodorus, which is explicitly named twenty-three times in addition to nine other references to Apollodorus, including four to other books written by Apollodorus. From this famous author of antiquity Diogenes has gathered biographical data[97] in addition to dates of births,[98] of important biographical events,[99] of periods of maturity,[100] and of deaths.[101] Jacoby,[102] following Diels,[103] has shown that materials based on Apollodorus' influential chronology had found their way into Diogenes and other authors through the anonymous biographer of the Academics (second century B.C.), Sosicrates, Demetrius of Magnesia, Dionysus of Halicarnassus, and others. Diogenes ascribed some of the dates in his philosophical manual to Sosicrates and to Demetrius of Magnesia and to other writers not treated in this connection by Jacoby.[104]

As a cultivated Athenian and Alexandrian, Apollodorus had in his *Chronology* emphasized the history of literary men and of philosophers. His work, which supplanted that of Eratosthenes,[105] the Alexandrian librarian, written a century earlier, is said to have been divided into four books, the first including the period from the fall of Troy to the

[97] IV 28 VIII 52 IX 25, 50 — IX 61 — X 10, 13 — IV 23 — I 74 — VIII 90 — VI 101 VIII 90 — etc.

[98] I 37 II 7, 44 III 2 V 9 IX 41 X 14.

[99] V 9, 36, 58 VIII 152 X 14.

[100] IV 45 VIII 90 IX 24, 56.

[101] II 2, 3, 7, 44 IV 65 V 9 VII 184 VIII 58, 152 IX 56 X 14.

[102] Jacoby, "Apollodors Chronik," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* XVI (1902), 1–416.

[103] Diels, "Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronica," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXI (1876), 1–54.

[104] I 62, 68, 95, 101 — II 56 V 75 VI 79 — VIII 48, 51 II 7, 44, 56, 12 VIII 51, 74 I 68 III 3, 3 IV 58 V 6 VIII 53 IX 18, 41, 41 X 1 I 2 II 58 VIII 74.

[105] For Diogenes' references to Eratosthenes the index of Hicks may be consulted.

Persian wars, the second to Alexander, the third to the end of the second Punic war, and the fourth to the days of Apollodorus himself. The so-called Chronology had been composed as a didactic poem in iambics, presumably in preference to hexameters in the interest of simplicity of presentation and to aid the memory, but actually with serious consequences to such essential features as convenience of arrangement, intelligibility, unambiguity, and exactness. Hence it became necessary later to recast the materials of Apollodorus into the form of chronological tables, which was done supposedly in the first century B.C. A few of the poetic lines of Apollodorus have been preserved by Diogenes at the beginning of the biography of Empedocles (VIII 52).

Whether Apollodorus had employed the method of some of his predecessors, who had computed dates on the basis of generations (*γενεαί*) of twenty-five, thirty, thirty-three and one-third, forty, or even one hundred years, is not clear, according to Jacoby. But Apollodorus had introduced, or at least employed, the method of dating important recorded achievements of great men at the age of forty in their lives. Thus Diogenes has Solon enact his laws, Periander become tyrant, and Xenophon go to Cyrus at the time when they "flourished."[106] This method was based on the Pythagorean division of human life into four quarters of twenty years each (VIII 10) as against Solon's division into ten periods of seven years each (I 55). Metrical considerations are said often to have necessitated the substitution of some form of the verb *γεγονέναι* for the term usually employed for the age of maturity, *ἤκμαζε*, or even for the term *ἤθνησκε*, either in the work of Apollodorus (Diels) or in the later synchronistic tables (Jacoby). Diels supposes that in the original works of Apollodorus and of his successors there

[106] I 62, 95, 98 II 55.

were at least some indications of the methods by which specific dates were arrived at, while of course only the dates themselves have come down to us. But that these dates were fixed by series of computations made centuries after the events to which they are supposed to refer and on the basis of the most meager data, seems clear.[107]

Whatever precise designations in terms of years had been made by Apollodorus himself had been made, according to Jacoby, with reference to the reign of archons, the reckoning of years within Olympiads having been introduced by Timaeus. Diogenes gives his dates in terms of the reign of archons as well as in terms of Olympiads and of years within Olympiads.[108] In designations of these types the first year was included in the reckoning as well as the last full year of an archonship or the remaining portion of the last uncompleted year of an individual life.[109]

Tables of dates, lists of archons, and similar works were welcomed by the ancients in the establishment of synchronistic references, especially where definite dates were wanting. The Greek tendency to assume intimate relations between eminent personages was freely applied in the linking of dates assigned to great men with the dates assigned to their supposed contemporaries or predecessors.[110] This tendency had an important bearing on the traditional phil-

[107] Examples of important events at the age of forty are I 68, 110 II 12 V 9, 75 VIII 48, 51, 53 IX 41. Other examples of the influence of the figure 40 are I 98 II 7 IX 56. In addition to the dates referred to in notes 98 to 101, Diogenes has given other dates of births (II 45), deaths (I 37, 62, 79, 95 II 56 III 3, 41 IV 61 VI 79 VIII 51, 90), periods of maturity (I 62, 72, 79, 98 II 2, 55, 59 VI 87 VII 6 VIII 45, 74 IX 1, 20, 23, 29, 58), periods of residence (I 101 II 7 V 9 X 1), length of service as heads of schools (IV 1, 14, 61 V 36, 58, 68), etc.

[108] I 62, 59, 79, etc. [109] I 98, 95 II 44, 2 III 2 V 9, 10 X 14.

[110] I 72; III 2 cp. II 2; V 10; VIII 74 cp. IX 56; II 54 VI 79.

osophic successions, for pupils were usually made to flourish forty years after their teachers.[111] Diogenes abounds in synchronisms,[112] an instructive case in point being Democritus, who compiled his *Lesser Diacosmos* 730 years after the fall of Troy and was one year older than Socrates, forty years younger than Anaxagoras, the pupil of Anaxagoras and of the school of Oenopides, and a contemporary of Archelaus, Parmenides, Zeno, and Protagoras (IX 41).[113]

There were also other prolific sources of mistakes, confusions, and ambiguities in the recording of dates. Texts may have become corrupted very early. Thus Sosicrates had corrected the statement of Apollodorus that Thales, who lived from Olympiad 35 to 58, had died at the age of seventy-eight, by making him die at the age of ninety (I 38). The reckoning of Apollodorus would be correct if we supposed that the Olympiad in which Thales was born was 39 instead of 35 (E having been frequently corrupted into Θ), but even on the basis of the reading supposedly before him Sosicrates' figure should have read ninety-four.[114] Erroneous insertions also seem to have occurred, as the assertion that Anaximander (instead of Pythagoras) was a contemporary of Polycrates (II 2).[115] The last year of an

[111] I 37 cp. II 3; I 38 cp. I 37 II 2, 3 I 121; II 7 cp. IX 41; II 44 cp. III 2; VII 6; IX 23, 25, 29; etc.

[112] I 38, 55, 56, 72, 95 II 2, 3, 7, 12, 44, 55, 56, 138 III 3, 3 IV 27 V 9, 9, 10, 36, 75, 83 VI 76, 79 VII 6 VIII 51, 52 IX 18, 34, 41, 49, 57 X 1, 15, 23.

[113] Diels has communicated an interesting example of synchronism from Valerius Maximus: "Polystratus et Hippoclides philosophi eodem die nati eiusdem praeceptoris Epicuri sectam secuti patrimonii etiam possidendi habendaeque scholae communione coniuncti eodemque momento temporis ultima senectute extincti." (Diels, "Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronica," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXI [1876], 1–54.)

[114] Jacoby, *op. cit.,* 178, 179.

[115] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* I, 132, note b.

active career seems frequently to have been taken as the year of death.[116] Diogenes' accounts were also abbreviated at times beyond intelligibility.[117]

Of the biographical sources mentioned by Diogenes, Neanthes of Cyzicus is quoted for the Cynic customs, the Pythagorean discussions, and various biographical data.[118] Satyrus' *Lives* was drawn upon for accounts of Empedocles, the bigamy of Socrates, the story of the tripod, etc., and Heraclides' epitome of Satyrus for versions of deaths.[119] Hermippus, besides recounting the remarkable ways in which the philosophers died,[120] contributed other biographical items[121] and accounts of the Magi, the sages, Pythagoras, and the name "Peripatetic."[122] Antigonus of Carystus described a death, a friendship, the way in which Pyrrho was preserved from harm by his friends, the critical marks in the books of Plato (explained in Antigonus' *Life of Zeno!*), etc.[123] A book on Alexander served Diogenes for a reference to the geometry of Pythagoras, another on Achilles for the story of the bowl of Thales, still another on Dion for the philosophical training of Zeno.[124] A work named *Aristippus on the Luxury of the Ancients* was the source for many of the stories on sex relations,[125] Panaetius' work

[116] I 79 cp. 75. See also IV 61.

[117] See Jacoby's explanation (*op. cit.*, 157 f.) of I 74. In II 8 "at Athens" should refer to the archonship of Callias (*op. cit.*, 245).

[118] VI 113 VIII 55, 58, 72 IX 4 I 99 III 3, 4, 25.

[119] VIII 53, 58, 60, 69 II 26 I 82, etc. — VIII 40 IX 26. It is not clear which Heraclides is quoted II 43, 135 VIII 60.

[120] I 72, 117 II 120, 142 III 2 IV 44 V 91 VI 99 VII 184 VIII 40, 69 IX 4, 27, 43, X 15.

[121] Descent, I 106 V 1 VIII 1, 51; philosophizing, II 109 X 2; books, VIII 56, 85 X 2; speeches, II 38, 55 VI 2; trials, II 13 IX 27; exiles, II 142 V 78; appearance, V 67.

[122] I 8, 42 VIII 88, 10 V 21.

[123] II 143 IV 22 IX 62 III 66, etc. [124] VIII 11 I 29 VII 2, etc.

[125] I 96 II 23, 49 III 29 IV 19 V 3, 39 VIII 60.

On Cheerfulness for the story of the way in which Xenophanes, like Anaxagoras, buried his sons with his own hands (IX 20), etc. Demetrius' *Homonyms* provided namesakes, biographical details, and such stories as that of Zeno of Elea biting off the nose of a tyrant.[126] Collections of anecdotes by Hecato, Metrocles, and Zeno of Citium enriched the chapter on the Cynics with entertaining stories and furnished one story on each of the Stoics Zeno and Cleanthes.[127]

From the general works on philosophers Diogenes culled such isolated items as the story of Plato's birth, the mention of a namesake, the legislative activity of Parmenides, and the study of the Epicurean philosophy by the three brothers of Epicurus.[128] Diocles' *Synopsis of the Philosophers* is given as a source for the Stoic logic and the simple life of the Epicureans, his *Lives of the Philosophers* for the military training of the sons of Xenophon and anecdotes of Aristippus, and the name of Diocles, without reference to book titles, for sayings and anecdotes of the Cynics and for information concerning Stoics, Pyrrho, and Epicurus.[129] Of the works on the *Successions,* the book written by Alexander is quoted not only for philosophic successions, but also for the names of fathers, of native cities, of Plato's gymnastic teacher, and of the Academy, and for Pythagorean doctrines.[130] Antisthenes is cited for the teachers of Theodorus, Sosicrates for dates in the lives of sages, and both for other miscellaneous items.[131] Sotion's *Succes-*

[126] I 38, 79 IX 27, etc.

[127] VI 4, 32, 95 — 33 — 91 — VII 26, 172.

[128] III 2, 109 IX 23 X 3.

[129] VII 48 X 11 II 54, 82 VI 12, 13, 20, 36, 87, 91, 99, 103 VII 166, 179, 181 IX 61, 65 X 12.

[130] I 116 II 19 IX 61 I 116 IV 62 I 116 II 106 VII 179 III 4, 5 VIII 25.

[131] II 39 I 38, 62, 68, 95, 101, etc.

sions of Philosophers is given as authority for the relation of teacher and pupil in a few instances, lists of writings, a version of the trial of Anaxagoras, the story of Aristippus and Lais the courtesan, and miscellaneous items.[132] Heraclides' epitome of Sotion is cited on the writings and death of Pythagoras, political advice, an Olympic victory, and the youth of Epicurus.[133] The most frequently quoted of the writers *On Philosophical Sects* is Hippobotus, the authority for a list of nine sects, an account of the Cyrenaic doctrine of pleasure, and such stories as that of Heraclides and the snake.[134]

A half dozen doctrinal epitomes furnish some opinions of the Stoics, Epicureans, and Cyrenaics, and polemical treatises yield a few items in the nature of personal controversies and a bibliographical notice.[135] Works on physics, the cosmos, etc., are cited for the most part for Stoic physical doctrines (some forty-five references to twenty-three titles); other physical writings for the doctrine of the virtues, the interpretation of a myth, the Egyptian symbols of divinity, etc.[136] Treatises on ethics, the end, etc., are cited for Stoic ethical doctrines (some thirty-two references to nineteen titles), except Aristotle on friendship, Achaicus and Persaeus on personal data, and Diogenes on Epicurean views of the wise man.[137] Plato in the *Laws* disapproved of oversleeping and commended the truth, Heraclides in his book *On Government* spoke of the relatives of Pindar and in his *Laws* of the lawmaking activity of Protagoras, etc.[138]

[132] V 86 VII 183 VIII 86 IX 5, 21, 115 II 85 VI 80 II 12, 74 I 17, 98 VI 26 IX 18, 112, 20, 110.

[133] VIII 7, 44 V 79 VIII 53 X 1.

[134] I 19 II 88 V 90 VI 102 VIII 69 IX 5, etc.

[135] VII 39, 48, 54, 181 X 11, 135 II 92 V 92 X 4, 5 III 37.

[136] VII 125, 187 I 10 VIII 6, 21, 56 IX 22.

[137] V 21 VI 99 VII 28 X 118.

[138] III 39 I 94 IX 50 I 58 VIII 13 VII 121, 129, 131, 188, 34.

Works on dialectic, definitions, etc., are cited for Stoic dialectical doctrines (some eleven references to as many titles), except Artemidorus in the chapter on Protagoras and Hieronymus, who in his work *On Suspense of Judgment* calls Phaedo a slave.[139]

Varied sources of typical references. — A large part of the contents selected by Diogenes Laertius from the body of literature cited by him is thus seen to have been selected, not according to the criterion of what was probably characteristic of the respective writings in that body of literature, but in accordance with his own interests. The kind of judgment that has made such distortion possible is revealed in the various kinds of sources from which the typical references of Diogenes Laertius have been drawn. Such a comparison will also reveal the comparative lateness and the general unreliability of the sources in question.

Diogenes' authorities on astronomy are Eudemus' *History of Astronomy*, Favorinus' *Miscellaneous History* and *Memorabilia*, Parmenides, Theophrastus, Hesiod (quoted by Zeno), Euripides (who, following his teacher Anaxagoras, called the sun a "golden clod"), Callimachus (who, in his *Iambics*, spoke of Thales as the discoverer of Ursa Minor), and Timon (who, in his *Silli*, praised Thales as an astronomer).[140] The authorities on mathematics are Apollodorus the arithmetician, Pamphila, Hieronymus, Callimachus in his *Iambics*, Anticlides in his *Alexander*, Favorinus, Plato in his *Republic*, and Callimachus in his *Tables*.[141] The authorities on inventions are Favorinus, Caeneus, Aristoxenus the musician, and Aristotle's *On Education*.[142] The authorities on the part played by the philosophers in mili-

[139] IX 53 II 105.
[140] I 23 II 1 IX 23 VIII 14, 49, 48 II 10 I 23, 34.
[141] I 24 VIII 12 I 24, 27, 25 VIII 11, 48, 83, 86.
[142] II 1 IV 2 VIII 14 IX 53.

tary affairs are Xenophon, Diocles, Ephorus, Apollodorus, Aristoxenus, and *Aristippus on the Luxury of the Ancients.*[143] Eratosthenes, Favorinus, and Euripides are the authorities on athletes.[144] Satyrus, Euphantes in his Histories, Hermippus in his *Seven Sages,* and Speusippus *On the Philosophers* tell of philosophers as legislators.[145] Diodorus' *Memorabilia* has contributed to the history of education, and Dieuchidas' *Megarian History* to that of Homeric interpretation.[146]

To the oratory of Socrates, witness was borne by Idomeneus, Favorinus, Xenophon, Aristippus, and Plato, and the eloquence of Aeschines was attested by his speeches and by the praise of Timon.[147] The religious achievements of Epimenides have been described by Lobon, Demetrius, and Theopompus; of Menedemus, by Hippobotus; and of Empedocles, by Satyrus and by Heraclides in his book *On Diseases.*[148] The reasons for the deification of Pythagoras have been indicated by Herodotus, Heraclides, Favorinus, Aristippus in his book *On the Physicists,* Aristoxenus, Hieronymus, and Pythagoras himself.[149] Witticisms dealing with religion are credited to Zoilus of Perga and to Timaeus' *History.*[150]

The illustriousness of the family of Empedocles was vouched for by Hermippus, Heraclides (*On Diseases*), Eratosthenes (*On Olympic Victories,* quoting Aristotle), Heraclides (*Epitome*), and Favorinus, and the miraculous birth of Plato by Anaxilaides in his *Philosophers,* Speusip-

[143] II 50, 56, 54 I 74 VIII 82 II 23.
[144] VII 42 VIII 12 I 56.
[145] I 68 II 141 VIII 88 IX 23.
[146] IV 2 I 57.
[147] II 19, 20, 29, 62, 63. See also X 13 II 39.
[148] I 112, 114, 115 VI 102 VIII 59–62.
[149] VIII 2, 4, 15, 21, 21, 14. See also IX 60 VIII 90 V 90.
[150] VI 37 VIII 11.

pus in *Plato's Funeral Feast,* and Clearchus in his encomium on Plato.[151] Ancestries were traced, or family names given, for Thales by Herodotus, Duris, and Democritus, for Aristotle by Hermippus, etc.[152] Names of parents, or at least of the father, have been recorded by Apollodorus (for Protagoras also by Dinon in his *History of Persia*), by Theopompus, Plato (*Theaetetus*), Aristoxenus, etc.[153] The sources for the birthplaces of the philosophers included Duris, Aristoxenus, Hermippus, Hippobotus, Eupolis' *Flatterers,* and the like.[154] Information on the youthful training of the philosophers has been derived from Athenodorus' *Walks,* Alexander's *Successions,* etc.[155]

The manner in which philosophers began to philosophize was described by Hecato in his *Anecdotes,* Diocles, Antisthenes in his *Successions,* Hermippus, etc.[156] The Academy was associated with Plato by Alexander in his *Successions,* Timon, Eupolis in his *Shirkers,* and Favorinus in his *Memorabilia.*[157] For illustrations of pioneer achievements Favorinus is drawn upon in thirteen instances, and for other instances in astronomy: Parmenides, Zeno, Theophrastus, and Eudemus; in mathematics: Plato's *Republic,* Pamphila, and Apollodorus the arithmetician; in physics: Demetrius' *Homonyms* and Theopompus; in ethics: Timaeus; in dialectic: Favorinus, Sotion, Plato's *Euthedemus,* and Artemidorus the dialectician; etc.[158]

[151] VIII 51, 53 III 2. [152] I 22, 89 III 1, 2 IV 17 V 1 X 1.

[153] IV 28 IX 18, 25, 50 I 22, 74, 106, 116 IV 62 I 109 II 18 III 3 V 36 VIII 29, 51, 53, 83 IX 61, 109, 109.

[154] I 74, 89, 106, 108, 116 II 106 VIII 179 V 36 VI 84, 99 VII 12 VIII 51, 63, 54, 1 I 108 IX 50, 109 X 4.

[155] III 3, 4 V 67 VII 2 VIII 3 IX 34 X 1.

[156] VI 95 VII 181 VI 87 VII 3 X 2.

[157] III 5, 7, 25.

[158] For Favorinus see note 93. — IX 23 VIII 48 I 23 — VIII 83 I 24 — VIII 85 I 116 — VIII 10 — III 24 IX 23, 20, 53. — Inventions,

The social position of the philosophers has been indicated by Sosicrates, Duris, Timon, Aristoxenus, Satyrus, Onetor, Myronianus, Favorinus, Demetrius of Magnesia, Diocles, and Hermippus.[159] Epicurus, who "says somewhere that Protagoras was a porter," is an example of the use of sources for notes on the occupations of the philosophers.[160] The sources for the personal characteristics of the philosophers were mainly Timon and the comic poets, especially for Plato, Zeno, and Pythagoras.[161] The voices of Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno were described by Timotheus in his *Lives;* that of Zeno also by Apollonius of Tyre and by Chrysippus in his *Proverbs;* and that of Prodicus by Plato in his *Protagoras.*[162] The clothing of Socrates has been described by Ameipsias the comic poet, Plato in his *Symposium,* and Aristophanes; etc.[163] Comments on the name of Plato were made by Neanthes, Alexander, and Timon, and on the names of others by Alexis, Timon, and Favorinus.[164]

For the marriage of Socrates, to choose one example under the head of marriage, the sources were Satyrus, Hieronymus, and Aristotle;[165] besides Aristippus, sources for stories of sex-life were Favorinus, Didymus' *Tabletalk,* Apollonius of Tyre, Aristoxenus, Sotion, and Neanthes.[166]

VIII 14 IV 2; education, IV 2; rhetoric, VIII 57 II 20, 65 IV 2; politics, I 68; Cynic customs, VI 13; history of philosophy, VII 185.

159 I 75, 82 II 19, 20 III 9 IV 114 V 76, 108 IX 36 VI 91, 99.

160 IX 53 VII 168 VIII 58 IX 61.

161 Timon, II 126 IV 33 VII 16, 161, 175 VIII 36 IX 6. Comic poets, see notes 74–78. III 28 VII 37 VIII 37. Other sources, I 72, 107, 115, 26 III 26 II 126 VI 22, 28, 81 IX 1, 25.

162 III 5 V 1 VII 1 IX 50.

163 II 28 V 67 VI 23, 93, 87, 91 VII 169 VIII 73.

164 III 4, 26 I 81 II 6 IX 50.

165 II 26 V 3 II 114, 138 VI 88. Children, I 82 IV 26, 138 VIII 42.

166 Aristippus; see note 125. IV 63 V 76, 76 VII 6 II 19, 74 III 25.

Clearchus and Xenophon have described the exercise taken by Pittacus and Socrates, respectively;[167] ten other writers have told of the homes of philosophers, including their dwelling with friends or with tyrants;[168] and still other writers, such as Hieronymus in his *Scattered Notes* and Diocles in his *Epitome,* have narrated other details from the lives of the philosophers illustrating their manner of living,[169] their parties, or their manner of conducting themselves in the circle of their friends.[170]

Aristotle, Favorinus, and Ion of Chios, who wrote on the journeys of Socrates, are instances of writers quoted on the journeys of the philosophers.[171] Miscellaneous writers are quoted on the tyrants and their relations to the philosophers, including Heraclides on *Government,* Heraclides' epitome of Sotion, Demetrius on *Homonyms,* Aristotle, Timon in his *Iambics,* etc.[172] On the political activities of the philosophers Sosicrates, Pamphila, Herodotus, and Demetrius in his *Homonyms* are cited,[173] and on their judicial and legislative activities Hipponax, Heraclitus, and Demodicus, as well as Apollodorus in his *Legislators.*[174]

Not a few criticisms of the philosophers and stories of attacks upon them have been selected out of the books quoted by Diogenes. Favorinus tells how Pollis, who had sold Plato into slavery, was afterwards defeated and drowned, "his treatment of the philosopher having provoked the wrath of heaven"; the charges raised against Epicurus

[167] I 81 II 32.
[168] I 27, 95 II 24, 63, 52 IV 22 VII 9 IX 38, 66 X 10.
[169] I 26 V 16 VIII 14 IX 112, 36, 42 X 11.
[170] II 140 I 101 III 8 VI 33, 36 VII 1, 26.
[171] II 23 IX 81 II 52, 106 III 6 II 109 V 28 IX 35 II 65 IX 15, 65 II 59 VI 20.
[172] I 49, 94, 96 IV 8 V 79, 89 VIII 72, 63 I 96 VIII 63, 64 IX 9, 110.
[173] I 68, 68 III 23 I 95 V 75.
[174] I 84, 58.

were collected from Stoic writings, Sotion's *Diocletian Refutations,* Theododorus' *Against Epicurus,* Timocrates' *Merriment,* etc.; names of such as criticized Socrates were taken from the third book of Aristotle's work on *Poetry;* Demetrius of Phalerum in his *Defense of Socrates* testified to the unpopularity of Diogenes of Apollonia; etc.[175] The trial of Anaxagoras is recounted from Hieronymus' *Scattered Notes,* Satyrus' *Lives,* Hermippus' *Lives,* and Sotion's *Successions;* the trial of Socrates from Antisthenes' *Successions,* Plato's *Apology,* Favorinus' *History* and *Metroön,* Justus of Tiberias, Eubulides, and Amphicrates *On Illustrious Men;* the trial of Plato and Aristotle from Favorinus; and the trial of Protagoras from Aristotle.[176]

Demetrius of Phalerum in his book *On Old Age* and Panaetius the Stoic tell how Xenophanes in his old age buried his sons with his own hands, and Favorinus tells on the authority of Hermippus, whose account in turn is taken from a remark of Arcesilaus to Lacydes, that Theophrastus in his old age had to be carried about in a litter.[177] Of the accounts of the ways in which philosophers died, fifteen have been taken from Hermippus, and four from Heraclides, of whom Timaeus says: "But Heraclides is everywhere just such a collector of absurdities, telling us, e.g., that a man dropped down to earth from the moon."[178] Others having written on modes of death included Plato in his *Phaedo* and Aristotle on Socrates, Myronianus' *Parallels* and Theopompus on Plato, Callimachus in his *Iambics* on Diogenes, Philochorus and Euripides in his *Ixion* on Pythag-

[175] III 20 X 4–8 II 46 IX 57. See also notes 78 and 80 as well as II 38, 43, 44, 65, 105 V 77, 92 VI 25 VII 173, 187–189.

[176] II 14, 41 III 19 V 5, 9 IX 54.

[177] IX 20 V 41.

[178] See note 120. II 143 VIII 40, 44, 67 IX 26 VIII 72.

oras, and numerous others, a total of about twenty-seven.[179] The last request of Solon is reported by Cratinus in the play called *The Chirons,* and Hippobotus reports the existence of a statue of Empedocles.[180] According to Aristotle, innumerable authors (including even Isocrates, according to Hermippus) had written epigrams on Gryllus, the son of Xenophon, and Diogenes has mentioned some sixteen other authors who have transmitted inscriptions and epitaphs on philosophers.[181] Two lists of namesakes are specifically attributed to Demetrius (I 38, 79), and the authors mentioned within those lists number sixteen.[182] Little, if any, discrimination was shown by Diogenes among the various types of writers who had mentioned the philosophers[183] or praised them;[184] enough, that these have been so mentioned or praised.

The characterization of philosophy as the love of wisdom as made by Pythagoras has been preserved by Sosicrates in his *Successions* and by Heraclides in his *De Mortua,* and the comparison of the philosopher to the all-round athlete made by Socrates to Democritus has been preserved in Plato's *Rivals* according to Thrasyllus.[185] As regards the various schools, we have the list of Hippobotus; Hermippus in his *Lives* explained the origin of the term "Peripa-

[179] II 42, 45 III 40 VI 76 IX 27, 4 VIII 73, 74 I 118 IV 4 I 95, 115 II 143 IV 54 VII 184 VIII 40 IX 27, 115.

[180] I 62 VIII 72.

[181] II 55 I 90, 119, 120 II 111 IX 17 I 29 III 25, 25 IV 25, 25 VIII 43 IV 45 VIII 65 V 11, 6, 11 VII 29, 30, 30 X 12 VIII 48.

[182] I 38, 38, 79 II 104 V 61 I 99, 119, 119 II 15, 104 IV 58 V 85 II 104 III 109 IV 15 V 35 IV 58 VI 101 VIII 90 VII 186 VIII 90. See also I 99.

[183] I 23, 31, 107, 114 IX 15 I 89 VI 83 IX 40, 25 III 4, 34 IX 40 III 37.

[184] I 12, 23, 120 VI 14, 14, 15 VIII 60 IX 38 X 23 IX 15, 18, 25, 25, 40 I 88.

[185] VIII 8 I 12 IX 37.

tetic"; Timon assailed the Academics; Athenaeus commended the Stoics; Eratosthenes *On the Old Comedy* and Epicurus in his letters explained the origin of the term "Stoic"; Demetrius credited Chrysippus with first lecturing in the open air in the Lyceum; Neanthes is authority for the story of the excommunication of Empedocles and of Plato from the Pythagorean school; Menodotus gave a different account of the fortunes of the school of Timon from that given by Hippobotus and Sotion; Theodosius in his *Skeptical Chapters* denied that Skepticism should be called Pyrrhonism; and Skeptical passages are quoted from Plato, Xenophanes, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Hippocrates, Homer, Zeno of Elea, Euripides, and Democritus to prove the existence of Skepticism before the school of the Skeptics.[186] The names of the teachers or pupils of the philosophers have been taken in part from books on the *Successions of Philosophers,*[187] but also from other writers, not excluding Timon or Pamphila in her *Memorabilia.*[188] The popularity of Stilpo is proved from an exact quotation from Philippus the Megarian philosopher; the testimony of Glaucus of Rhegium that Democritus had been taught by a Pythagorean is given as trustworthy because Glaucus was a contemporary of Democritus; and the testimony of Favorinus to the opposition of Democritus to the views of Anaxagoras proves that the former was not a pupil of the latter.[189]

Lists of the writings of the philosophers have been given,

[186] I 19 V 2 IV 67 VII 30, 5, 185 VIII 55 IX 115, 70, 70–73. See note 157.

[187] Sotion, V 86 VII 183 VIII 86 IX 21, 115; Heraclides, II 113, 113, 120; Alexander, II 19 IX 61; Antisthenes, II 98 IX 57; Sosicrates, VI 82.

[188] II 13 IV 33, 63 V 36 VIII 54, 56 IX 21, 69 X 13, 14.

[189] II 113 IX 38, 34. On Plato see III 46, 47; on Zeno, VII 2, 24, 25, 36 VI 86.

or the number of their writings have been indicated: in the case of Plato, by Thrasyllus; of Aristippus, by Sotion and Panaetius; of Crates, by Apollodorus in his *Chronology;* of Pythagoras, by Heraclides and Heraclitus; of Empedocles, by Aristotle, Neanthes, and Hieronymus; of Eudoxus, by Eratosthenes; of Democritus, by Thrasyllus; of Timon, by Antigonus.[190] "First" writings on various subjects have been reported by Favorinus, Theopompus, and Demetrius.[191] The lines of Thales were counted by Lobon. No writings had been composed by Aristippus or Diogenes, according to Sosicrates, or by Hippasus, according to Demetrius.[192] The writings of the philosophers were attacked or defended as to their genuineness: in the case of Epimenides and Xenophon, by Demetrius; of Aeschines, by Menedemus, Persaeus, and Pisistratus of Ephesus; of Socratic dialogues, by Panaetius; of Plato, by Favorinus; of Heraclides, by Aristoxenus, Chamaeleon, etc.; of Diogenes, by Favorinus, Satyrus, and Sotion; of Zeno, by Chrysippus; of Ariston, by Sosicrates and Panaetius; of Empedocles, by Heraclides; and of Pythagoras, by Callimachus.[193]

Some authors have noted the manner of the composition of some of the writings, as when three comic poets testified that Socrates helped Euripides make his plays, or Empedocles was said by Theophrastus to have imitated Parmenides or by Hermippus to have imitated Xenophanes, or Pythagoras according to the statement of Ion of Chios ascribed his poems to Orpheus.[194] Different arrangements

[190] III 50, 56–61 IX 45 II 56, 85 IV 23 VIII 6, 7, 57, 89 IX 37, 38, 41, 45, 111.

[191] II 11 III 48 VIII 83 I 116 VIII 85.

[192] I 34 II 84 VI 80 VIII 84.

[193] I 112 II 57, 60, 64 III 62 V 92 VI 73, 80 VII 34, 103 VIII 58 IX 23.

[194] II 18 III 9, 37 VII 181 VIII 55, 56, 8.

were made in the grouping of Plato's dialogues by Aristophanes the grammarian and by Thrasyllus, the former having adopted the division into tetralogies, the latter into trilogies.[195] The style of Epicurus was acknowledged by Aristophanes the grammarian to be "characteristic," Apollodorus called attention in an exact quotation given by Diogenes to the many quotations in the writings of Chrysippus, Dicaearchus censured the style of Plato's *Phaedrus* as vulgar, and Aristotle judged the style of Plato's dialogues as midway between poetry and prose.[196]

Favorinus relates that when Plato read his dialogue *On the Soul* Aristotle alone remained to hear it to the end, that Aristotle purchased the works of Speusippus for three talents, and that the *Purifications* of Empedocles were recited at Olympia by Cleomenes the rhapsode.[197] The fortunes of Plato's works were described by Antigonus of Carystus in his *Life of Zeno,* similar accounts being given by Theophrastus, Seleucus, Ariston, Hieronymus, Demetrius, Hippobotus, Isidorus, and Hermippus.[198]

Sayings of Antisthenes have been taken from Diocles, Phanias in his work on the Socratics, and Hecato's *Anecdotes;* witty sayings of Diogenes the Cynic are quoted from Menippus' *Sale of Diogenes,* Eubulus' book of the same title, Dionysius the Stoic, Cleomenes' *Concerning Pedagogues,* and Hecato's *Anecdotes;* and the sayings of other philosophers as well are taken from a variety of sources as divergent as Aristotle's *Ethics* and Theopompus' *Mirabilia.*[199] The way in which quotations are frequently brought in, especially from the poets, to render the discus-

[195] III 61. See also III 37, 57 VIII 66.

[196] X 13 VII 181 III 38, 37.

[197] III 37 IV 5 VIII 63.

[198] III 66 IX 6, 11, 12, 16, 40 VII 34 VIII 57, 85.

[199] VI 12, 8, 4 — VI 29, 30, 43, 75, 32 — VII 172 V 21 VI 89 II 20, 21, 31 I 33, 117 II 27 I 40, 60, 63 VIII 10 I 80, 68.

sion, or a saying, more ornate, is well illustrated in the life of Polemo, of whom Diogenes writes: "Altogether he was a man such as Melanthius the painter describes in his work *On Painting*. There he says that a certain wilfulness and stubbornness should be stamped on works of art and that the same holds good of character. . . . He was . . . refined and generous and would beg to be excused, in the words of Aristophanes about Euripides, the 'acid, pungent style,' which, as the same author says, is 'strong seasoning for meat when it is high.'" [200]

As regards philosophic doctrines in general, Posidonius assures us in his *Exhortations* that divergences of opinion ought not to cause us to abandon philosophy. Of the Pythagorean doctrines, we learn from Aristoxenus' *Rules of Pedagogy*, Alexander's *Successions*, and Aristotle. On the doctrines of the Skeptics, Numenius and Antigonus of Carystus are quoted along with Aenesidemus. Ascanius of Abdera testifies that Pyrrho adopted a most noble philosophy. On Plato's doctrine of the one, we have the comment of Theopompus in his *Hedychares*.[201] While Theophrastus in his *Physics* "set forth all the tenets of almost all the schools," this book is cited by name for but one tenet: the identification of soul and mind by Parmenides. Stoic writings are quoted for the divisions of philosophy and their order of treatment, the Cyrenaic view of the divisions of philosophy being given in Meleager's *Philosophical Opinions* and Clitomachus' *Sects*.[202]

Physical doctrines are taken for the most part from Stoic and Epicurean writings, but comic poets are as good authorities on physics as they.[203] While the ethical doc-

[200] IV 18, 19. See also I 76, 76, 77 II 82 IV 22, 35 IX 67, 69.
[201] VII 129 VIII 15, 25, 36 IX 68, 62, 78, 106, 62, 61 III 26.
[202] IX 22 VII 39 II 92. See also II 136, 134 X 12.
[203] VIII 67 III 28 I 24, 24 IX 51.

trines of the Stoics and Epicureans are attributed to their own writings, the Cyrenaic doctrine of the good is taken from Panaetius and Hippobotus *On the Sects,* Amphis the comic poet is said to have ridiculed Plato's doctrine of the good, and the teaching of the Cynics on virtue is quoted from Antisthenes' *Heracles.*[204] In dialectic the sources are — besides Diocles for the detailed statement of the Stoic logic and Timon and other Skeptics for the teachings of the Skeptics on dialectical questions — the following: Plato's *Euthydemus* and Dionysius of Chalcedon for the Eristics, Timon for Euclides, an unnamed comic poet for Eubulides, Aristotle's *Sophist* for Zeno of Elea, and Timon for Protagoras. Heraclides tells of the sport made of dialectic by Menedemus, and Favorinus of the historical development in the use of definitions. Platonic divisions are quoted from "Aristotle," and Plato's use of terms is compared with that of Chrysippus.[205]

The author's interest in the sources. — In the light of the many weird combinations of sources and references which we find mingled in Diogenes' book with what may presumably have been appropriate quotations, any attempted reconstruction of works cited by Diogenes Laertius could not, so far as such a reconstruction might be based on the references of Diogenes, lay claim to being a successful, even though partial, reconstruction of such works, for even if Diogenes had read them it does not appear either that he has understood them or that he has transmitted to us, in any adequate or significant manner, their characteristic contents. His interest was clearly not in the authors he has cited, but in the comments they may have made on subjects that interested him.

[204] II 87, 88 III 27 VI 105.

[205] VII 48 IX 78 II 30, 106, 107, 108 VIII 57 IX 52 II 135 VIII 48 III 80, 109, 63.

The Problem of the First-Hand Sources

Method of treatment. — The haphazard and uncritical manner in which Diogenes Laertius quotes his alleged sources, moreover, warrants an attitude of suspicion toward the supposition that he may have used at least some of the professed sources at first hand, and therefore renders the various theories that have been elaborated concerning the supposed primary sources of Diogenes Laertius highly questionable. These theories, of which the Diocles theory of Nietzsche and Jacoby's attempted reconstruction of Apollodorus' *Chronology* are typical cases in point, have to a large extent been based on the method of crediting the various writers adduced by Diogenes with materials not ascribed to them by Diogenes Laertius himself. While it may be possible to supply from the context the names of some sources used by Diogenes, as when Hicks refers the "many wonderful stories" told about Pherecydes (I 116) to the *Mirabilia* of Theopompus which is cited in the preceding and subsequent paragraphs,[206] it seems safer, generally speaking, for the purpose of gaining a conception of Diogenes' use of his sources, to apply a more rigorous and positivistic method to the interpretation of his references.

It is characteristic of Diogenes, in lengthy sections containing uncredited materials, to ascribe only certain specific statements to some alleged sources. Thus, in the many stories about Aristippus, only Sotion's *Successions* and Bion's *Lectures* are expressly given as sources, there being, in addition, five general references to "other" authorities.[207] Sometimes authorities are introduced as though they had been selected from a large number of authorities, as when we read that "some, including Choerilus the poet, declare

[206] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius*, I, 123, note a.

[207] II 66–83. See also I 7 II 87–93 VI 1–10, 20–81 VII 48, 184.

that Thales was the first to maintain the immortality of the soul."[208] In the accounts of the doctrines of the Cyrenaics, Stoics, Skeptics, and Epicureans, the ascription of opinions to the entire respective school is often supported by references to individual representatives of the school only, as when it is said of the Cyrenaics, "they hold that life according to virtue is the end to be sought, as Antisthenes says in his *Heracles*, exactly like the Stoics."[209]

Again, it may be necessary for us to oppose a tendency to attribute uncredited notes of Diogenes Laertius to authors to whom he has credited similar or related notes. While it is not impossible to suppose, e.g., that Diogenes has taken his lists of homonyms for all forty-eight philosophers for whom such lists or references are given from the *Dictionary of Men of the Same Name* by Demetrius of Magnesia, although express credit is given to Demetrius for the first two of these lists only (I 38, 79), it seems equally, if not more, plausible to suppose that if Diogenes had actually had Demetrius' *Dictionary of Homonyms* before him he would have cited it at every opportunity that presented itself. The facts that in one of the two instances mentioned the name of Demetrius appears in conjunction with that of Favorinus (I 79) and that in the other instance two other works are mentioned within the list of namesakes (I 38), seem to speak in favor of the latter supposition, as does the fact that although 257 namesakes are mentioned, including the respective philosophers treated, but sixteen writers are cited within the lists of namesakes for only twenty-one of the namesakes. A comparison of the total number of references

[208] I 24. See also I 23, 25, 75, 79 II 18, 19 III 3, 4, 9, 9, 62 VII 2 VIII 12.

[209] VI 104, 105 VII 40, etc. IX 76, etc. X 30, etc. Cf. IX 102. The dependence of one authority on another is indicated, IX 5 V 41 II 40.

in Diogenes' book to the main subjects in which he was interested with the number of those references to the respective subjects which are attributed to sources that would seem appropriate to them will reveal the inadequacy of any theory fastening on any of the writings thus quoted as primary sources used by Diogenes Laertius.

Statistics. — Certainly, the five explicit references to Aristophanes, or the nine to Euripides, or even the forty-four to Timon, including the ten expressly naming the *Silli,* do not furnish any proof that may be desired that Diogenes was directly acquainted with the works of these poets and did not quote them at second hand. The four references to the four works on painting, three of which are merely said to mention an individual, the twelve references to painters, and the two to paintings, do not show any first-hand use or understanding of the works on painting cited. No study of religions is indicated in the three references to religious books outside of Book VII, though there is a total of nearly 350 allusions to things religious. Theopompus' Θαυμάσια is mentioned twice only, though the word θαυμαστός occurs over fifty times. Books on education are cited four times, but not on the subject of education, to which there are about forty allusions in all. Of twenty-six mathematical allusions, but one is derived from a work on mathematics; of approximately fifty allusions to astronomy, but five are from astronomical works; and as against two quotations from one book on diseases there are ten allusions to medicine in addition to the ten referring to namesakes as physicians.

Of the writers not included among the philosophers treated, the one whom Diogenes quotes most frequently is Favorinus, to whom there are forty-eight references. But when we consider that of the more than 120 pioneer achievements recorded by Diogenes thirteen are said to

have been taken from Favorinus, there being twenty-three references under this head to other sources; that of the nineteen trials of philosophers related only five are referred to eleven sources in all, three of them to Favorinus; that but nineteen biographical incidents, nine comments on writings, three on speeches, two on sayings, and one each on personal appearance and namesakes are represented as having been taken from Favorinus, — the theory that Diogenes may have used Favorinus [210] is seen to be groundless, or at least useless for the understanding of the book.

The Diocles theory of Nietzsche breaks down similarly in view of the facts that the *Synopsis of Philosophers* is quoted for only one doctrinal and one polemical account and the *Lives of the Philosophers* for only two biographical notes, that the sayings and anecdotes taken from Diocles are limited to the Cynics, etc. Nor can Hippobotus, the author of a work on philosophical sects, who is quoted fifteen times, two of the quotations having to do with philosophic sects, come into serious consideration as a first-hand source. The single quotation from the commentary of Apollonides of Nicaea on Timon's *Silli* is, again, an insufficient basis for the theory singling out Nicias as the " Vorlage " of Diogenes Laertius.

The fact that of the biographical works represented in Diogenes' book the epitome of the *Lives* of Satyrus by Heraclides should be twice expressly named while Satyrus' *Lives* is expressly named four times in addition to seven other references to Satyrus, is a reasonable indication that at least the latter was not directly known to Diogenes Laertius. Of few works is consistent use made under the various heads in the biographical sections of Diogenes' compilation; the references are, generally speaking, scattered and detached. To exemplify by two illustrations

[210] See Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* xiv, *ad* VIII 53.

which would be most favorable to Diogenes in this respect: while *Aristippus on the Luxury of the Ancients* is mentioned about eight times and other sources collectively an equal number of times in connection with courtesans, favorites, etc., Diogenes touches on matters of sex over one hundred times in all; and while there are about forty references to different sources (exclusive of chronology) in the accounts of the deaths of twenty philosophers, fifteen references among which are to Hermippus, Diogenes comments more or less extensively on the deaths of sixty-nine of his philosophers.

Seventeen of his dates Diogenes refers to Apollodorus, who is represented in all ten Books of the work; scattered over the ten Books are also twenty-eight dates referring to twenty-one other sources, only the dates given by Demetrius being found in more than one Book;[211] twenty-eight dates are uncredited. There are forty philosophers for whom no dates are given, except that the age at death is given for seven of these; and of the namesakes only the first scientific boxer, Pythagoras, is dated definitely, seven namesakes being dated indirectly. Of thirty-four philosophers, we are told at what age they died; for ten of them there are divergent accounts of their ages. The sources credited with the figures noted number seventeen, Apollodorus being cited in this way six times; and some twenty-four figures are uncredited.

While Diogenes has recorded the testaments of six of the philosophers, he has given credit to the collection made by Ariston of Ceos for the will of Strato only (V 64). Nor has Diogenes given us any intimation of the sources from which he has drawn the letters which he mentions or quotes from the correspondence of the philosophers.[212] The only

[211] II 56 V 79 VI 79.

[212] Note I 112 III 9, 61 VII 6 VIII 55 X 3.

sources given in connection with the "songs" of the philosophers are Aristoxenus, Aristippus, and Aristotle.[213]

Of the hundreds of sayings recorded by Diogenes, only thirty-eight are acknowledged as having been taken from twenty-three sources, including thirteen from Diocles, three from Hecato, and two from Favorinus. The seventy quotations from the poets included among the sayings of the philosophers, of which twenty-six are from Homer and twenty-one from Euripides,[214] do not betray a direct acquaintance on the part of Diogenes with the poems from which they have been taken.

For important doctrinal accounts of some twenty of the philosophers no authorities are given.[215] That Diogenes would have quoted extensively from the original writings of the leading teachers of the various schools for their doctrines, had he possessed a knowledge of their writings, may be inferred from the fact that he does at first glance seem to claim acquaintance with the writings of Stoics, Skeptics, and Epicurus, especially with those of the Stoic Chrysippus, to whom there are sixty-one references — more than to any other writer — in Diogenes' book. Nevertheless even these writings of the philosophers are not cited at important points in the doctrinal résumés where their testimony would have been exceedingly apropos. Thus, in some fifty of the 122 sections on Stoic doctrines there are no such references, the fewest omissions being in the sections on physics. Similarly, the Skeptics are designated in a general way by the plural "they" from IX 90–105. Also the Epicureans are designated in this way in the introductory account of the Epicurean doctrine of the criterion and in

[213] IV 15 V 4 VIII 57.

[214] See the respective footnotes in the Hicks edition.

[215] II 1, 3, 8, 17, 85, 106 V 28 VI 95 VII 160, 165, 165 VIII 76, 85 IX 7, 19, 24, 29, 30, 44, 57.

the statement of the Epicurean views of the wise man.[216] Indeed, for thirteen of the philosophers treated there are no references to any sources whatever,[217] and for twenty there are but one or two references each, often of little significance as when for Anaximenes and Melissus but a date from Apollodorus is noted.[218]

Once-quoted sources. — The sources to which there is but a single reference each number 120. They include twenty-one of the philosophers treated such as Anaxagoras, Anaximenes, Pythagoras, Sextus, etc., and an equal number of other philosophical writers such as Epictetus, Numenius, Manetho, etc. There are among them also six poets, eight comic poets, two epigrammatists, and two dramatists, in addition to six biographical works, four histories, and two works each on chronology, memorabilia, criticism, painting, and the sale of Diogenes. Eight references to miscellaneous books such as Phlegon's *Longevity*, etc., and thirty-two references to writers by name only complete the list. These once-quoted sources are adduced chiefly for biographical data, but also for doctrinal opinions, comments on writings, and personal criticisms. Thus the beginning of the treatise of Alcmaeon is quoted to indicate his descent, Euphantus in his *Histories* described the dignity of Menedemus, Eumelus in his *Histories* recorded the manner of Aristotle's death, others contained the story of the bowl of Thales or of the Cynic Diogenes or some other story, etc.[219] Ascanius of Abdera, Numenius, and Zeuxis are quoted on the teachings of the Skeptics; others tell of the esoteric

[216] X 32–34, 117–121.

[217] II 16, 121, 122, 124, 124, 125 IV 59, 67 VI 96 VII 165, 177 VIII 78 IX 30.

[218] I 101 II 1, 3, 98, 105 IV 16, 24 V 65 VI 82, 84, 94, 102 VII 166 VIII 83, 84, 84 IX 24, 57, 58.

[219] VIII 83 II 141 V 6 I 29 VI 23 I 40, etc.

teachings of the Pythagoreans, of Demosthenes as a pupil of Plato, etc.[220] Fourteen once-quoted authors are named for as many items on literary activity. Epictetus is cited for his criticism of Epicurus (X 6) as are others for personal criticisms directed against the philosophers. Undoubtedly many of the authors cited in but a single reference each by Diogenes Laertius would have resented the selection alleged to have been made by that compiler from their writings as even remotely typical of the thoughts they would have desired to see preserved to posterity in conjunction with their names.

Interpretation of the data. — The cumulative evidence with regard to the manner and the frequency of the citation of sources by Diogenes Laertius points overwhelmingly therefore to the precariousness of the endeavor to trace or to analyze the literary background of his work and the futility of the attempt to elevate any of the writings adduced by Diogenes into first-hand sources for his compilation. There is every indication that Diogenes Laertius gathered his materials from miscellaneous sources such as handbooks and anthologies to which he may have given little or no credit, into which stray bits of philosophy had found their way by devious paths, and from which he could not, moreover, have gained a true insight into his subject matter. For the numerous references of Diogenes Laertius to the literature quoted in his book are indicative of his own mentality and of the tastes of his readers, and they may shed light on the writers thus introduced by him, but they shed far less light on the Greek philosophers whom he proposed to treat.

[220] IX 61, 68, 106 VIII 42 III 47, etc.

References to the Writings of the Philosophers

The fragmentary nature of the references. — That the many sources named by Diogenes Laertius in the body of his work, or the various unnamed sources through which the unauthenticated materials of Diogenes Laertius came to him, reflect, not the thinking of the eminent Greek philosophers, but rather the characteristic mental traits of the authors themselves, seems plain. This supposition is borne out not only by the manifest dependence of Diogenes Laertius on secondary sources,[221] but also by the types of references made by him to the original writings of the philosophers, representing (it may be supposed) the fragments of those writings which appealed to Diogenes and his clientele.

Statistics. — To the philosophers whose names are given in the chapter headings or who are treated more or less extensively in Diogenes' book there are about 450 references either by their names or by the titles of their writings (disregarding the question of the genuineness of these writings). Lists of writings have been made for twelve philosophers who are not represented in the source references,[222] and forty titles are mentioned in the references which are not included in the various lists of writings.[223] Of the more

[221] Note, e.g., at the very beginning of the work the sources cited for the barbarian philosophies and throughout Book I for the sages.

[222] II 110, 120, 121, 122, 124, 124, 125 IV 11 V 58 VI 83 VII 163, 166.

[223] Eubulides on *Diogenes,* Aristippus on the *Physicists* and on the *Luxury of the Ancients,* Bion's *Diatribes,* Demetrius' *List of Archons,* Heraclides' *De Mortua,* Menippus' *Sale of Diogenes,* Zeno's *Exposition of Doctrine* and *On Being,* Cleanthes on *Atoms* and on *Bronze,* Persaeus on the *Ethical Schools* and *Convivial Reminiscenses,* twenty of the twenty-seven titles given as sources from the writings of Chrysippus, Empedocles' *Purifications,* Eudoxus' *Voyage*

than 1,260 titles listed in the catalogues of the writings of the philosophers (exclusive of the sages), about seventy are mentioned by name in the references apart from the respective lists. The direct references to the works of the philosophers themselves are highly suggestive of the distortions of the contents of writings which are likely to occur when these writings are adduced by a writer of a later age. The results of such a process may be exemplified by a collection of the references of Diogenes Laertius to Plato and to Aristotle.

Plato. — According to the references of Diogenes to Plato by name (without book titles), Plato denied that the Corinthian Periander was the sage, mentioned all the early philosophers except Democritus, gave expression to a Skeptical utterance, and wrote narratives similar to those of Xenophon. Trivial data have also been collected by Diogenes Laertius in the direct references to specific writings of Plato. From the *Symposium* we learn, according to Diogenes, that Socrates on occasion wore fine clothes; from the *Lysis,* that Socrates, having the skill to draw arguments from facts, turned Lysis into a virtuous character; from the *Euthyphro,* that Socrates was able to divert Euthyphro from his purpose; and from the *Meno,* that Socrates treated Anytus as a fool. In the *Apology* Plato put themes into the mouth of Socrates which the latter disowned, gave the names of three accusers of Socrates, and mentioned himself. In the dialogue *On the Soul* Plato mentioned himself, abused Aristippus, had Socrates drink the hemlock "after much noble discourse," and employed the method of induction from agreement in his proof of the immortality of the soul.

Around the World, and Timon's *Python, Conceits, Senses,* and *Banquet of Arcesilaus* as well as his *Iambics* (said by Hicks, *ad* IX 110, probably to have been the proëm of the *Silli*).

In the *Phaedrus* Plato mentioned Zeno and recorded and controverted the speech of Lysias. In the *Protagoras* Plato listed the seven sages, called Prodicus deep-voiced, and cited a saying of Pittacus. In the *Republic*, which is said to have been found in Protagoras' *Controversies*, Plato declared that Archytas first discovered the cube and that Xenophon wrote a *Cyropaedia*. In the *Theaetetus* the names of the parents of Socrates are given, Socrates is said to have fired Theaetetus with a divine impulse, and Protagoras is said to have declared that the soul is nothing apart from the senses. According to the *Euthedemus*, Socrates saw no use in hair-splitting eristic and Protagoras was the first to use in discussion the argument of Antisthenes that contradiction is impossible. According to the *Parmenides*, Zeno of Elea was tall in stature; in the *Sophist* Zeno of Elea is mentioned; in the *Laws* Plato declared Xenophon's story of the education of Cyrus a fiction, opposed oversleeping, and extolled the truth; in the *Rivals* Plato mentioned Dionysius, who had taught him letters.[224]

Aristotle. — The references of Diogenes Laertius to Aristotle reveal a similar lack of understanding and appreciation of the works cited by the author. From the *Magicus* of Aristotle we get information, according to Diogenes Laertius, on barbarian philosophy; from the *Constitution of Delos* and the work on the *Pythagoreans*, about the customs of the Pythagoreans; from the book on *Poetry*, about the critics of Socrates, the writing of the dialogues by Alaxamenus, and the poetry of Empedocles; from the *Epitome of Orators*, the name of an Aristippus; from the *Sophist*, about the invention of dialectic by Zeno and of rhetoric by

[224] I 99 IX 40, 72 III 34 — II 28, 29, 29, 38 — II 45, 39 III 37 — II 65 III 36 II 42 III 55 — III 25 — I 41, 22, 30, 108 IX 50 I 77 — III 37, 34 — II 18, 29 IX 51 — II 30 IX 53 — IX 25, 25 III 34, 39, 40, 4.

Empedocles; from the treatise on *Education,* about the invention of the shoulderpad by Protagoras. From unnamed writings of Aristotle we get information about the ascription of a soul to inanimate objects by Thales, the tyranny of the Corinthian sage Periander, the journey of Socrates to Delphi, his marriage, and the prediction of his death by a Syrian magician, the epitaphs of Gryllus, the style of Plato's dialogues and the divisions of Plato, an ancient namesake of Strato, the customs of the Pythagoreans, the grandfather of Empedocles, his championship of freedom, and his death, the death of Heraclitus, the accuser of Protagoras, and the travelling of Argos across the deserts of Lybia without drinking.[225]

Conclusions from the investigation. — Surely, if we had to depend on the references of Diogenes Laertius for our knowledge of the philosophers we should have a wholly inadequate and distorted conception of the philosophers. The Alexandrian scholars whose interpretations had furnished the background for the cumulative impressions conveyed by Diogenes Laertius had obviously failed completely in their knowledge and understanding of the classic philosophies. The total impression gained of Diogenes by a close examination of his references to his sources is one of great industry, but also of lack of discrimination, coördination, and trustworthiness. Diogenes and his predecessors manifestly did not weave their materials into their compilations

[225] I 1, 8 VIII 13, 34 II 46 III 48 VIII 57 II 104 IX 25, 53 — I 24, 98, 99 II 23, 26, 45, 55 III 37, 80, 109 V 61 VIII 19, 36, 49, 51, 63, 52, 74 IX 15, 54, 81. — Xenophon, II 29, 19, 65. Polemo, II 104 III 46 IV 58 V 85 VII 2. Theophrastus, VIII 48, 55 IX 6 V 37 VI 22 IX 21, 22. Stoics, X 3-6 IX 68 VII 48 II 87 IX 20 II 64, 85 III 47, etc. Parmenides, I 107 VIII 14. Pythagoras, VIII 14. Heraclitus, I 23, 88, 76 IX 73, 1, 5 VIII 6 IX 6. Democritus, I 22, 23 IX 72, 106, 41, 42. Skeptics are quoted chiefly for Skeptical opinions. Epicurus, VII 9 X 13 IX 53, etc.

from reliable authorities, but "lugged" them in from the most promiscuous sources imaginable. Diogenes indeed might almost as well have given his work the title by which he quotes one of the works of Aristoxenus, *τὰ σποράδην*, or of Hieronymus of Rhodes, *τὰ σποράδην ὑπομνήματα*. The estimate of Frobenius and Episcopius that Diogenes Laertius was well versed in the writings of the ancients, "quae res uehementer esset commodo studiosis, si extarent omnes quorum hic uidemus nomenclaturam," therefore seems in need of revision; and the attempts which have been made to reconstruct the writings which were current in the Hellenistic age, but which are known to us only from the references contained in the compilations of Diogenes Laertius and other writers of his day, must be viewed, at least so far as the references of Diogenes are concerned, in the light of the fragmentary manner in which those writings have been quoted and which undoubtedly involved a considerable distortion of their characteristic contents.

Even if we should grant, however, that Diogenes Laertius was able to discriminate between expert and non-expert testimony, that his quotations are characteristic of their alleged sources, that at least a limited degree of confidence may be placed in the originality of his references, and that it may be possible from his compilation to reconstruct in part the most important of the writings adduced by him, it would nevertheless follow from the nature of those writings that by such a reconstruction of them we should learn how the Greek philosophers were interpreted by a later age rather than what these philosophers themselves had taught.

Chapter III

HIS TRIBUTES TO THE EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS

His Conceptions of Philosophy

A vital enterprise. — The sources which formed the literary background for the compilation of Diogenes Laertius largely determined the lines followed by him in the interpretations he has given us of the ancient Greek philosophers. These interpretations were dominated by his views of the eminence, the lives, and the opinions of his philosophers. These views in turn were controlled by his fundamental conceptions of philosophy. Diogenes Laertius was manifestly conscious of the persistence of philosophy as a vital enterprise, as is shown by his constant use of the term φιλοσοφεῖν,[1] though he does not appear to have possessed a clear consciousness of the meaning of the term.

An educative process. — In the treatment of Diogenes Laertius, philosophy was an educative process. It was fostered by the schools. The foremost position in the schools was held by their founders, who determined the character of their schools and the names by which their followers became known.[2] Ambitious philosophers were expected to found a school, which they often accomplished when they were in their prime.[3] The founders were as a rule devoted to the cause of their schools, many occupy-

[1] I 6 V 2 X 17, etc. Hicks usually translates: "study philosophy."

[2] VII 30, 161 II 120, 144 IV 16, 1, etc. VII 161 I 19 II 112, etc.

[3] II 110 IV 16, 24, 25 VII 161, 174 VIII 56 (κατ' ἰδίαν φιλοσοφεῖν) X 2, 14, 16, etc.

ing their positions of headship for a considerable number of years.[4]

An education was incomplete without philosophy (II 79, 80). The ordinary education was even considered quite useless by some, or of limited usefulness.[5] Generally, however, the philosophers advocated education in striking sayings.[6] The educated were said to differ from the uneducated in good hope, as trained horses differ from the untrained, and as the living from the dead. Among the advantages of education were the intelligent appreciation of dramas, the ability to speak at banquets, consolation in adversity, etc.[7] The philosophers themselves were outstanding examples of educated men [8] and of educators.[9] Their teachings were often esoteric and sometimes deliberately stated in such terms as to be made quite unintelligible to the ignorant.[10]

Philosophers received their start as "pupils" who "heard," "followed," "philosophized under," their "teachers." To understand the philosophers it was necessary therefore to note the teachers under whom they had studied.[11] Varying views of philosophers often found their explanation in the influence of various teachers upon them.[12] Students became disciples of their masters in various ways, some having been directed by the latter to "follow" them,

[4] V 62 X 16 VII 28 V 68 IV 61, 14 V 58, 10 IV 1. Menedemus was an exception, II 130.

[5] VI 7, 103 VII 32 II 80 V 31 VII 32, 129 VIII 16.

[6] I 55, 91, 92 II 70 IV 10 V 18 VI 68, 73, 95, 97.

[7] I 69 II 72 V 40, 19, 21 II 33 III 99.

[8] II 20 III 4 V 80 VII 7 IX 37, etc.

[9] VI 30 VII 10 IX 13 I 9, etc.

[10] VIII 15, 55 X 5 III 63 VIII 13, 17 IX 6, 7, 12, 15, 42, 55.

[11] II 3 IX 21 III 5 I 13 VI 102 IX 30, 50, 116 II 86. Teachers of namesakes, I 119 II 15, 64, 83, 104, 109 IV 23, 58 V 35, 61, 83 VI 19, 35 VII 186.

[12] VII 184 II 3, 19, etc.

others having been attracted by striking utterances or personal characteristics of their teachers, still others having been won through the mediation of some third person, and not a few having had to force themselves on the attention of their prospective teachers by sheer persistency.[13] It was usually considered a distinct disadvantage to take up one's studies late.[14]

Many teachers were known for their ability to attract pupils, even in spite of difficulties in their doctrines, their severity as teachers, geographical distances, etc.[15] The hearers of Theophrastus numbered two thousand, and Diogenes won to himself two brothers, one of whom had gone in search of the other, and their father, who had in turn gone in search of his two sons.[16] Instances received special mention in which pupils themselves became famous, or included women, or relatives of the teachers, or kings, politicians, physicians, etc.[17] The cases of teachers who had but few disciples called for jesting or special explanation, although Epicurus would not have the wise man found a school " in such a manner as to draw a crowd after him," and Chrysippus declared, " If I had followed the multitude I would not have philosophized."[18]

Teachers differed in the subjects which they emphasized and in their methods of teaching,[19] but they wielded such a powerful influence that their students were often improved

[13] II 48 IV 29 VI 3, 94, 96 II 105 VI 82 VII 2, 3, 5, 31 VI 21 IX 12.

[14] IV 36, 60 (but: X 122). II 7 III 6 IV 6 V 9 X 2, 14 IV 36, 67.

[15] IV 37, 53 VII 27, 161 X 9 IV 67 VIII 14 III 46 VII 37 IX 58.

[16] V 37 VI 76. See also VIII 15 II 113, 102 III 46 IV 66 V 36 VI 76 VII 35, 36 VIII 3, 87.

[17] II 65, 75, 120 IV 23, 66 VI 21, 76, 84, 85, 95 VII 36, 179 IX 68 X 2, 13, 14 — IV 2 VI 96 — II 86, 83 — II 141 V 4, 36, 57, 58 VI 76 VII 169 VIII 16, 78.

[18] VI 69, 4 VII 182 IV 53 II 63 X 120 VII 182.

[19] V 3 VI 73, 103 IV 19 V 2, 3 VII 5, 185 II 130, etc.

by mere personal contact with their teachers.[20] Timon and his pupil Dioscurides even resembled each other to such an extent that both were one-eyed![21] The intimate relations existing between some of the teachers and pupils are described[22] as well as the gratitude shown by the pupils to their teachers.[23] The words of the teachers were to be remembered, their last sayings were cherished, and the sententious remarks in which they characterized their pupils were preserved.[24] Also some interesting "tales out of school" had been handed down to posterity such as the story of Pyrrho, who endeavored to escape the questioning of his pupils by stripping and swimming across the Alpheus.[25]

The members of a school were bound together by the ties of friendship and of common customs.[26] Their most commendable virtue was loyalty to the teachings of their masters,[27] and their greatest vice secession from the school, especially in the lifetime of the master.[28] Loyalty to their own school as a rule involved contempt for other schools. Thus the Stoics were hostile to the Epicureans, and Diogenes was great at pouring scorn on others.[29] Nevertheless some teachers recommended other teachers to their pupils, the Stoics and the Cynics resembled each other in their ways of life, and philosophers were willing to come under the influence of the leaders and members of other schools.[30]

[20] VI 3, 15, 21 IX 61 II 108.
[21] IX 115. See also II 56 IV 19, 32, 36, 53, 54 VII 16 VIII 56.
[22] IV 6, 29 V 9 VII 176, etc.
[23] II 13, 121, 130, 65, 74, etc.
[24] II 4, 48 VIII 7 X 12 V 41 X 16 IV 6, 30 V 2, 39 VII 18, 38.
[25] IV 7, 59 VI 40 VII 170, 184 IX 69.
[26] X 9 VI 31 VIII 1–12 V 62.
[27] IV 1 V 1 X 17.
[28] IV 28, 51 V 2 VII 162, 179 VIII 55 X 6, 9.
[29] VI 24, 40 VII 32 VIII 87 IX 34 X 3–8.
[30] VI 3 VII 121 VI 103, 104 IV 33, 62, 67 VII 25 VIII 48 IX 38.

In cases of need the members of one school gladly helped the members of another. Xenophanes, e.g., was ransomed from slavery by two Pythagoreans, and Plato by a Cyrenaic.[31] There were also conversions from one school to another, even from the Epicureans — despite the saying of Arcesilaus to the contrary.[32]

The relations of philosophers to their schools were thus described by Diogenes Laertius in ethical terms. The hold which the various schools of philosophy had on their adherents was personal and moral as the benefits they had to bestow were ethical.

A moral influence. — Hence, philosophy was a moral influence. It made men over. The devotion to the philosophic life was tantamount to a conversion. It became important therefore to note the conditions from which a man was won for philosophy, the circumstances of his conversion, the teachers through whose influence the conversion was brought about, the right methods of gaining converts, the effects of philosophic conversion, the possibility of progress in philosophy, the requirements and advantages of a life of devotion to philosophy, and the elements that were necessary to make up the ideal wise man.

Varied were the circumstances from which many had been delivered by philosophy. Phaedo was ransomed from a house of ill fame. Bion had come from similar surroundings.[33] Zeno never ceased to bless the shipwreck which had driven him to philosophy. Others gave up their occupations or ceremoniously burned their poems and literary compositions on coming into contact with philosophy.[34] While Parmenides had been instructed by both Xenophanes and

[31] IX 20 III 20.
[32] IV 22, 29, 43, 51 VII 162, 184 X 9.
[33] II 31, 105 IV 47 VI 49 VII 3, 181 X 2.
[34] VII 5 II 125 III 5 VI 95.

Ameinias, it was to the latter that he owed his conversion. Disciples were to be won, said Zeno to Crates, " by the ears " rather than by violence, and according to Timon by fleeing from them rather than by pursuing them.[35]

The results of taking up philosophy were such as to turn men from effeminate pleasures and completely reform their character, the outstanding example of such a reformation being the dissolute youth Polemo, who eventually became head of the Academic school.[36] Nevertheless the teachings of the best of teachers were not always effective, and not all philosophers showed their philosophical dispositions at all times. Persaeus could not conceal his disappointment at a personal loss, the pupils of Diogenes did not share his cosmopolitanism, Bion by his evil conduct gave the enemies of philosophy occasion to blaspheme, and Menedemus condemned Persaeus as the worst of men.[37] Witness was borne to the possibility of progress in philosophy by the teaching of the Cyrenaics on that point and by the reference of Posidonius to the moral progress of Socrates, Diogenes, Antisthenes, and their followers.[38] Among the advantages to be derived from philosophy were the knowledge that there is a time for all things, conduct free from restraint, the ability to feel at ease in any society and to converse with oneself, being prepared for every fortune, etc.[39] An enterprise such as the philosophic life required great ability, persistency, sacrifice, and a comprehensive mind such as that of Democritus, to whom Socrates said in the *Rivals* that the philosopher is like the all-round athlete (IX 37).

The effects of philosophy being ethical, the descriptions

[35] IX 21 VII 24 IX 112.
[36] IV 16–18 VII 8 III 57.
[37] VII 36 VI 72, 76 IV 47 II 144.
[38] II 93 VII 91.
[39] IV 42 V 20 II 68 VI 3, 63, 86.

of the ideal wise man are given in ethical terms. The views of Aristippus, of his followers and their opponents, of Epicharmus, Plato, Aristotle, Antisthenes, Diogenes, the Skeptics, the Stoics, Herillus, Empedocles, and the Epicureans on the wise man are given,[40] the questions debated including the existence of the wise man, his advantages over others, his mode of life, the part he was to play in practical affairs, and the claims that may be made for him.

The Cyrenaics believed in the existence of the wise man while Crates and Empedocles did not, Xenophanes remarking to the latter that "it takes a wise man to recognize a wise man." Epicharmus attributed understanding to all living creatures, the Cyrenaics recognized that some of the virtues were found even in the foolish, the advantage of the wise according to Hegesias is mainly negative, while Cassius and the Skeptics accused Zeno of declaring all those not virtuous to be enemies. Hegesias considered life to be advantageous to the fool, but indifferent to the wise, whereas Herillus believed that only the wise could seek the true end of life. The Cyrenaic, Stoic, and Pyrrhonean wise man would not feel grief as would the Aristotelian and Epicurean, though according to the Epicureans the wise man may be happy even on the rack. The wise man is guided by the law of virtue rather than by the established laws according to Antisthenes, while according to Hegesias he is guided by his own interests. The Theodorean and Cynic wise man had no need for friendship as had the Stoic and Epicurean wise man. Aristotle, Antisthenes, and the Epicureans permitted the wise man to marry; according to others the wise may practise community of wives; and as against the Cyrenaics and the Epicureans, Theodorus, Aristotle, Antisthenes, the Cynics, and the Stoics permitted the

[40] II 73, 91–93, 95, 96, 98, 99 III 16, 78 V 30 VI 12, 51, 56, 72, 89 VII 22, 117–125, 165 IX 20 X 117–120.

wise man to fall in love. The wise man was excluded from politics by the Epicureans, but not so by Aristotle and the Stoics. He was permitted by the Stoics and the Epicureans to pray, but the latter would not have him make fine speeches or compose panegyrics. He must, according to the Stoics, be a dialectician and, according to the Epicureans, a dogmatist.

Holding such and similar views about the wise man, the various schools vied with each other in applying complimentary terms to the ideal wise man. The Cynics declared him worthy to be loved, impeccable, and a friend to his like; the Stoics regarded him as passionless, free from vanity, godlike, and infallible; the Epicureans credited him with overcoming all hatred, envy, and contempt by reasoning. Diogenes Laertius himself ascribed wisdom to a number of the philosophers in his epigrams as did other authors of epigrams cited by him. "If anyone is truly wise he brings blessings both in his lifetime and when he is no more."[41] The various versions of the story of the tripod and the story of the oracle concerning Socrates are illustrative of the interest in the identity of the wisest of men, and Democritus, who had received the nickname of "Wisdom," was extolled by Diogenes Laertius as omniscient.[42]

Well might Diogenes the Cynic, in view of such fruits of philosophic teaching, protest at the proclamation of the victory of an Olympic victor: "Nay, he is victorious over slaves, I over men" (VI 43). Well might the heads and members of the various schools of philosophy guard the integrity of their teachings by which they aimed to produce such results.

A tradition to be conserved. — For philosophy was, in the last analysis, a tradition to be conserved and defended. It constituted so many systems to be protected and main-

[41] I 120, 39, 34, etc. [42] I 28, 82, 106 II 37 IX 50, 43.

tained by those who had framed the systems and by their followers, friends, and successors, for only the great leaders and teachers had a philosophy of their own, which others received from them at second or third hand.[43] The value of a philosophy was to a large extent determined by the authority, character, and reputation of its originator.[44] The preservation of the traditions in their original form, sometimes for generations, was proof of their vitality and of the loyalty of those who kept them inviolate.[45] The systematic nature of the classic philosophies made it possible for them to be epitomized and catalogued according to their origin, periods, schools, and subject matter.[46] Those philosophers therefore who committed their teachings to writing furthered the process of the fixation of their doctrines, while those who failed to leave any writings hindered this process, showed that they themselves had an inconstant nature, and were therefore deserving of the severest censure.[47]

Although agreement was achieved in the schools of philosophy, even on minor points, there were also controversies within the schools. These controversies sometimes concerned important points of doctrine such as the permanence of virtue.[48] Between one school and another there was no lack of controversy, especially between the Skeptics and the dogmatists.[49] Written attacks of the phi-

[43] III 63 IV 28 VII 180 VIII 45, 56 — X 57, 12, 16 V 1, 41 II 11, 86 VII 182 IV 1, 67 — VII 179 VIII 56 X 2, 14, 17.

[44] VIII 8, 41, 46 X 6.

[45] IV 28 VII 84, 167, 168 VIII 45 IX 116 X 10.

[46] X 28, 35 I 2 III 47, etc. — I 13–15 — I 13–15, 18 II 16 III 56 — I 13–21 II 86 VII 84 IX 22 X 74, 120, 136 — I 18 VII 84, etc.

[47] IV 67 VIII 15, 24, 78 II 136 IV 32.

[48] VII 64, 76, 68, 140 II 85, 135 IV 51 V 62 VII 41, 84, 91, 120, 127, 139, 160, 162 IX 88.

[49] II 109, 113 IV 45, 62 VII 32, 162, 187 IX 69, 74. Schmidt has called attention (*Studia Laertiana,* 18) to the reference of Augustine

losophers abounded, even the brief writings of Herillus containing vigorous controversial passages directed against Zeno.[50] Many of the philosophers became formidable controversialists, the Megarians especially having been inspired with a love of controversy, and Alexinus becoming known as "Elenxinus" (*sic*).[51] Philosophy, in short, was a set of controversial dogmas (VII 129).

Some of the principal controversies, however, were personal in their nature. Especially Plato, Diogenes, and Xenophon figured largely in stories of personal animosities.[52] Diogenes Laertius was fond of citing historical examples of criticisms directed against eminent men and of quoting the jibes of comic poets.[53] Many of the philosophers were refuted "over the wine" or in a humorous manner, and there were conflicts also among the rhetoricians as well as between the rhetoricians and the philosophers.[54]

Indeed, Schmidt has endeavored to show that the history of Greek philosophy, as it found its way into the work of Diogenes Laertius and as it has come down to us through him, was born out of the conflicts between the various schools. These conflicts made it impossible for the writers on Greek philosophy to present their materials "sine ira et studio."[55] The numerous controversies of the sects with one another, according to Schmidt, concerned the opinions,

---

(*De Civitate Dei*, XIX, 1) to Varro, according to whom it would have been possible out of the great variety of philosophic doctrines to constitute 288 distinct sects.

[50] II 105, 110 III 35, 36 IV 42 V 35 VII 166 IX 18 X 26.

[51] II 117, 134 III 25 IX 18, 40 IV 62, 63 V 29 VI 24 II 108, 109, 135–137.

[52] II 61 III 34, 36 VI 7, 52, 58, 67 II 49, 57, 65, 83 V 68 IX 34, etc.

[53] II 46, 125, 134 VII 187 IX 92 X 3–8 V 11, 11 II 55, 56 IV 67 VIII 67 IX 111, 115.

[54] II 144 VI 52 VII 162, 162 II 64 V 35 III 25.

[55] Schmidt, *Studia Laertiana*, 1.

morals, originality, writings, and successions of the philosophers.[56]

Another aspect of the controversial element in the book of Diogenes Laertius is given in the controversies in which that compiler avowedly engaged on his own account. These included the beginnings of philosophy, the dogmatism of Plato, the character of the Pyrrhoneans as a sect, and the merits of Epicurus.[57] But the great systems and conflicts of the philosophers belonged to the past.

A product of antiquity. — Philosophy, we are assured, was a product of great antiquity. Diogenes Laertius traced its story to the very beginnings and interested himself in the philosophers of old. The Skeptics were the only sect whose representatives he traced — if we accept the beginning of the third century as the date of the book — to times near his own (Aenesidemus, Favorinus, Menodotus). We look in vain for a discussion of the Platonists, Peripatetics, Stoics, Neo-Pythagoreans, Jewish Hellenists, Christian Fathers, etc., in his own age, or of the Skeptic Lucian, or of the Neo-Platonists. "Our author was in the position," Strachey has observed, "in which a man writing nowadays would be in dealing with the days of Alfred or the Venerable Bede."[58]

Diogenes also informs us of the antiquarian interests of his philosophers and tells us of the ancients from whom they had borrowed their opinions. Anaxagoras, e.g., had stolen his views on the sun and the moon from the ancients, according to the statement of Democritus as reported by Favorinus, and Anaxagoras' very doctrine of the mind had been taken from the poem of Linus.[59] The descent of the

[56] VII 32, 187 IX 70 — II 65 V 1, 2 — III 8–18 IX 38 — VIII 6, 85 I 16 VII 180 X 26 — VIII 7 IX 38 IV 51 X 2, 12, 13 VII 162, 38.

[57] I 1, 5, 20 III 52 X 9.

[58] Strachey, "Shirtsleeve Portraits of Greek Philosophers," in the *New York Times*, April 4, 1926, Section 3, p. 7.

[59] IX 34 I 4 X 13 VII 2 IX 111.

philosophers is traced to remote antiquity by Diogenes. Our author delights in speaking of ancient books, documents, statues, altars, tombs, dishes, sundials, and customs that had been preserved until his own day.[60] His antiquarian interests extended also to the namesakes of the philosophers as well as to the barbarians.[61] The antiquity of the barbarians, however, though extending to more than 48,863 years before Alexander, was as nothing compared with that of the Greeks, "with whom not merely philosophy, but the human race itself began" (I 3).

A Greek invention. — Philosophy, it must be maintained, was a Greek invention. In contending for this theory Diogenes opposed what Schaefer, writing against Zeller, regarded as the common opinion not only among the Alexandrians, but among the Greeks themselves. The many writers who had written on this subject, the use that had been made by Greek writers of philosophical tables and of the laws of the barbarians, the knowledge possessed by the Greeks in the age of the Ptolemies concerning the Persians, the studies made of the writings of the barbarians in the Alexandrian library, the high opinion in which the Egyptians were held by the Greeks, and the fact that the most recent writer quoted by Diogenes Laertius in favor of the theory of the origin of philosophy among the barbarians was Sotion, who was about four centuries removed in time from Diogenes Laertius, testify, according to Schaefer, "vulgarem fuisse sententiam virorum doctorum Graeciae, neque minus Alexandriae in qua urbe historiae disciplinarum quam maxime florebant, *τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἔργον ἀπὸ βαρβάρων ἄρξαι.*"[62]

[60] I 9, 89 etc. VIII 58 II 40, 19, 132 V 77 VII 182 VIII 72 I 110 VIII 73 V 16 I 119 II 14. [61] I 3 V 61 I 2, 8, 5.

[62] Schaefer, *Quid Graeci de Origine Philosophiae a Barbaris Ducenda Existimaverunt,* 2, 50. Cf. p. 6, 13, 17, 27; 31; 37; 43; 48. Ménage (Huebner, *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium,* I, 152)

For Diogenes Laertius, however, it was unthinkable that philosophy should have originated among the barbarians, for whom he expresses contempt and whose very speech he held to be so ill adapted for philosophy that the very term "philosophy" *τὴν βάρβαρον ἀπέστραπται προσηγορίαν*.[63] This view seems to have been unique, and Diogenes Laertius cites no authors in confirmation of his own opinion. In view of his sentiments it occasions little surprise that Diogenes Laertius ignored such writers as had written on philosophical subjects in Latin, that he failed to quote the tributes of Lucretius to Epicurus and the exposition of the Epicurean tenets by that Roman poet,[64] that he slighted the treatments of Greek philosophy by Cicero and neglected to mention the eclecticism of Varro, that he disregarded the Roman Stoic Seneca, and that he scorned to draw on such poets as Vergil, Horace, and Ovid for at least a few lines to grace his collection of philosophical notes. Philosophy began — and ended — with the Greeks.

True, some of the early philosophers had gone to other nations for knowledge, and Hasdrubal philosophized at Carthage in his native tongue.[65] But Anacharsis the Scythian, who also spoke Greek, was enthusiastic about everything Greek, wrote on the institutions of the Greeks and the Scythians, tried to introduce Greek customs into Scythia, and became a martyr to Greek culture by being slain while

---

lists among the writers attributing the origin of philosophy to the barbarians: Justin Martyr, Tatian, Clement Alexandrinus, Theophilus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Theodoretus, etc. A thorough discussion of the question and extensive references to the pertinent literature may be found in the pamphlet by Theodor Hopfner on *Orient und Griechische Philosophie*.

[63] VII 16 I 33, 4. See also VI 2 VIII 49 II 142.

[64] Hicks gives pertinent references to Lucretius in footnotes, II, 560–626.

[65] I 89 II 125 III 5 VIII 2, 3 IV 67.

performing Greek rites (I 101–5). In many ways Diogenes Laertius expressed his predilection for Greek culture: in his epigrams, in the selection of letters quoted, in the exaltation of the fame of the philosophers among the Greeks, etc.[66] His allusions to historical events, wars, prominent personages, political incidents, legal enactments, economic concerns, social and religious customs, art, music, drama, and literature were such as appealed or were familiar to Greeks.[67] The desperate attempts of Diogenes Laertius to trace the beginnings of philosophy, including cosmological speculations, to the Greeks and the constantly recurring emphasis on the "first" achievements which were made by the various Greek philosophers (Thales, e.g., was the first astronomer, Pherecydes the first Ionian to expound theology to the Greeks, etc.) [68] mark the book of Diogenes Laertius as part of an earnest endeavor to revive Greek culture and to preserve that culture against encroachments from barbarian influences.

On the influence of the Laertian conception of philosophy as a Greek invention Professor Woodbridge has written: "It is the past not as it was, but as it was recovered in the imaginations of men, that makes history. So if you ask the cosmos the Greeks did not originate philosophy, but if you ask tradition they did. Their originality is defined by the fact that they were so long believed to be original. If we knew their predecessors that would help us to understand the Greeks and might alter their future reputation, but it cannot alter the fact that for twenty-five centuries they have been the originators for the Western world of that

[66] I 103 II 58 III 45 IX 14 I 105 VII 30 I 30 II 113, 114 III 25 VI 60 VIII 88 III 106 X 10.

[67] II 25 I 72, 50 III 1 I 45 VII 168 VIII 8 V 4 VII 165, 125, 160 II 57, etc.

[68] I 3, 4, 23, 43, etc.

peculiar kind of curiosity which we call philosophy. The course of events helped them wonderfully, but that was a characteristic of the course of events, the bare fact of the Greek habit of mind enduring amid vicissitude. We may therefore claim, using the words of a favorite Greek distinction, that while philosophy did not begin with the Greeks in the order of nature, it does begin with them in the order of ideas. First they were not, but first they are. They achieved a distinction which nature denied them."[69]

For Diogenes Laertius, however, it lay in the course of nature that philosophy began with the Greeks, and the Greek origin of philosophy conspired with its educative power, its moral influence, its honorable traditions, and its hoary antiquity to speak its praise.

A subject for eulogy. — Philosophy was, in fine, a subject for eulogy. As such it was, in the first instance, on a higher plane than poetry and the arts. Those who became philosophers gave up poetry or wrote poetry in their spare time.[70] Though the many-sided Democritus was expert in the arts, Diogenes the Cynic preferred those who trained their mind to those who acquired technical skill.[71] In music Pythagoras had made important discoveries, and Plato and Zeno had achieved remarkable insight, Plato dividing music into that which employs the mouth alone, that which employs both the mouth and the hands, and that which employs the hands alone. Diogenes and Antisthenes, however, considered philosophers as superior to musicians, even declaring the study of music useless.[72] Painting was abandoned by Menedemus, Plato, and Pyrrho.[73]

[69] Woodbridge, "Philosophy," in *Greek Literature* (Columbia University Press), 209.

[70] III 5 IX 110.

[71] IX 37 VI 70. [72] VIII 12 III 88 VII 21 VI 73, 104, 48.

[73] II 125 III 5 IX 61, 62.

Socrates had been a sculptor, and an interest in sculpture is reflected in the Diogenes stories revolving around statues.[74]

Philosophy was, moreover, held to be superior to rhetoric. Arcesilaus and Bion had escaped becoming rhetoricians by turning to philosophy. Many of the philosophers, however, were formidable rhetoricians, able to withstand the competition of their fellows or to vanquish the rhetoricians themselves.[75] Rhetoricians would even dismiss their classes to hear a philosopher like Carneades, and many rhetoricians had been taught by philosophers as Gorgias had been taught by Empedocles, Gorgias in turn being the only rhetorician mentioned as having had pupils among the philosophers.[76] Philosophers were capable of dividing rhetoric into its proper subdivisions, of employing a remarkable style in philosophy, of writing rhetorical treatises, of composing speeches, of giving advice on telling periods, and of teaching rhetoric.[77] Indeed, no less an authority than Favorinus declared that Socrates and Aeschines, the pupil of Socrates, were the first to teach rhetoric! But so formidable was Socrates in public speaking and so persuasive in conversation that the thirty found it necessary to forbid him to teach the art of words![78] On the whole, the rhetoricians were despised by the philosophers, especially by Diogenes, who was fond of distracting audiences from the performances of the orators through trivial means. The contempt in which rhetoricians were to be held is shown in the story of Aristippus, who found it

[74] II 19, 18, 33 VI 23, 35, 49, 50, 60, 69.

[75] IV 29, 47, 49 II 62, 114 VII 161 II 64, 108, 114 IV 62.

[76] IV 62 VIII 58 II 63 VI 1. See also I 84 II 19, 104 VI 75 IX 51, 52, 54 II 19 III 46.

[77] III 87, 93, 94 VII 42 IX 54 IV 52 V 82 VI 1 IX 51 II 17, 64, 104, 124 V 80 II 40, 63 IV 18 V 80 VI 1 VIII 65 IX 49 VII 20 V 3 IX 51.

[78] II 19, 20, 29.

necessary in self-defense to compare his hiring of a rhetorician with the hiring of a cook![79]

The term Sophist was similarly in reproach, though it had been applied to the early wise men by way of praise.[80] Sophisms had been employed on occasion by Theodorus, Hipparchia, and Protagoras, but Chrysippus contemned the sophistical fallacies of a certain dialectician as beneath the notice of experienced philosophers like Cleanthes.[81] Some had followed the career of a Sophist, usually as a last resort, Aeschines being prevented from doing so only by the popularity of Plato and Aristippus. At least one of them, however, Timon, gave evidence of his hostility to the Sophists in his report of the opposition of Pyrrho to the Sophists.[82]

Then, too, philosophy was to be distinguished from religion with its basic anthropomorphism as exemplified in Orpheus or the Magi. Religious practices provoked contempt for mankind in Diogenes the Cynic. The various stories told by Diogenes Laertius about the mysteries and about the attitude of the philosophers toward popular religious conceptions were probably intended to offset the influence of the Oriental mythologies on the common people and the Oriental, mystical, religious trend philosophy had begun to take.[83] According to Schwartz,[84] Laertius' was the most "nüchtern" of the biographies of Pythagoras written in the age which produced Neo-Pythagoreanism. So far as Diogenes Laertius gave expression to his own religious conceptions, especially in his epigrams, they appear to have been Greek.

[79] VI 47, 48, 57 cp. VII 173 — II 72 cp. II 40.
[80] II 102 IV 47 V 90 X 7, 25 I 12.
[81] IV 52 VI 97 IX 52 VII 182.
[82] II 65 V 84 IX 56, 110 II 62 IX 69, 112, 65.
[83] I 5, 6 VI 24 II 101 VI 38, 39, 45 I 86 II 135 VI 42.
[84] Schwartz, *op. cit.*, 763.

Philosophy was, furthermore, to be esteemed above ordinary and scientific knowledge. The relation between philosophy and the sciences was not clearly conceived by Diogenes Laertius, though it was vaguely felt that philosophy somehow brought such sciences as astronomy, mathematics, and geometry to their completion. Philosophers, having a comprehensive survey of all knowledge, ought to be heard at all times.[85] On the other hand, when philosophers are viewed in contrast to sages or Sophists, philosophy is to be distinguished as the "love of wisdom" from the "wisdom" which is to be attributed to God alone. From this point of view the ancient distinction between the "sages" or "possessors of wisdom" and the novices in philosophy or the "lovers of wisdom" was an unfortunate misapplication of terms. Philosophers are able only to yearn for, or to pretend to, wisdom, and the so-called sages of old are, in fact, not to be classed with the philosophers.[86]

Summa Summarum, philosophy is the acme of life. The philosophers had the best lot in life. To philosophize, according to Diogenes the Cynic, is to live well. Pythagoras declared the spectators of life, like those at the games, to be the best. And to the ordinary mortal who was surprised at the fright manifested by Aristippus in a storm at sea while the former was calm, the latter rightly replied, "The lives at stake in the two cases are not comparable." [87]

His Views of Eminence

The emphasis on eminence. — In harmony with his conception of philosophy as a subject of eulogy, Diogenes Laertius aimed in his story of philosophy to eulogize the

[85] IV 10 IX 37 II 130, 140.
[86] I 12 VIII 8 I 12 III 63 VI 64 I 122.
[87] VI 65 VIII 8 II 71.

eminent philosophers as he had in the Πάμμετρος "discoursed of all the illustrious dead" and as Amphicrates and Antiphon are said by him to have written on famous men and men of outstanding merit.[88] This aim of Diogenes Laertius is plainly expressed in the traditional title of the book, for although all philosophers were eminent by virtue of being engaged in the pursuit of philosophy, there were those who could be singled out as eminent even among them. Comparatively few of the philosophers named by Diogenes Laertius were honored with biographical and doxographical accounts. Repeatedly he insists that fame was the criterion of the choice of his subjects.[89] In general it appears that the farther philosophers were removed from the founders of their schools the less eminent they were held to be. That is the price we pay for belonging to a school founded by a famous leader: the more distinguished he, the more extinguished we!

The philosophers themselves were concerned about their fame, though some professed to despise fame. The subject of fame was even included in the teachings of the schools. The school of Hegesias judged fame as indifferent, Diogenes the Cynic ridiculed it, the Cynics generally despised it, Epicurus advised against it. Plato and Aristotle recognized fame as conducive to happiness, but Plato stated that the wise man could do without it while Theophrastus roundly declared the love of glory unprofitable.[90]

Grounds of fame. — The eminence of the philosophers may have been due to their wealth and birth or the renown of ancestors. Plato, Polemo, and Heraclitus had distin-

[88] I 63 II 101 VIII 3.

[89] II 144 IV 23, 66 V 35, 58 VI 83, 84, 85 VII 36 VIII 1, 50, 50, 91 IX 110 X 22. Cp. VIII 91 IX 110. For terms designating eminence, see I 71, 63 VI 95 V 83 IV 62, etc.

[90] II 131 VI 8, 41 IX 36 II 94 VI 72, 104 X 14 III 98, 78 V 30, 41.

guished themselves by their character, and others by their strength, beauty, wise management, accuracy in observation, etc. Contact with the great, especially the favor of tyrants, contributed to the reputation of several.[91] Some were honored in their own cities, others were more highly esteemed abroad. It was a special achievement to receive honors in Athens, though some dared to remain away from Athens, preferring to make a place famous rather than win fame from a place.[92]

The great were much talked about. A sure sign of greatness it was to have one's worth attested by another eminent personage as in the case of Pyrrho, concerning whom Epicurus made regular inquiries of Nausiphanes.[93] Perpetual fame was secured by being mentioned in a book. The philosophers mentioned each other,[94] it being especially noteworthy to be mentioned by a comic poet or by Plato, who, however, deliberately neglected to mention Xenophon, Democritus, and himself.[95] Often little more is known of the namesakes of the philosophers than that they were mentioned by some writer.[96] Diogenes' philosophers manifest a great concern to be remembered (*μιμνήσκεσθαι*) or to preserve the memory of great leaders and teachers.[97] Among the evidences of this concern were the writing of *ἀπομνημονεύματα* and of inscriptions and songs, the erection of tombs called *μνήματα*, and the making of busts and

[91] III 78, 89 IV 17 VIII 51 III 43 IV 19 IX 1 I 89 V 74 VII 28, 168, 169 IX 42 II 66 III 36 VII 6.

[92] IV 24 VIII 88 I 102 IX 15 IV 44 V 37, 77 VII 6 IX 57, 28, 37, 15.

[93] II 119 VIII 66 IX 42, 64, etc.

[94] III 40 V 58 VIII 54, 66 IX 38, 41 I 23, etc.

[95] I 22, 77 II 45 III 34, 36, 52 IX 23, 25, 55 III 34, 25, 37 IX 40. On the comic poets, see Chapter II, note 78.

[96] II 15, 104, etc.

[97] III 38, 40 V 16 X 12, 16, 36, 84 II 58 IX 67 III 4 IV 19.

statues.[98] The books of Diogenes Laertius himself were contributions to the preservation of the memory of the illustrious dead.

Types of achievement. — The philosophers gave abundant proof of their worth to the world by their achievements, which were of various kinds. They founded cities and temples, planned canals, purified cities, made statues, played on musical instruments, escaped infection in plagues, attained to moral and bodily health, won athletic contests, stayed the winds, brought rivers together, or saved their friends from tyrants.[99] Others enacted admirable laws, gave political advice, served on embassies, or distinguished themselves in political careers.[100] Still others took part in military expeditions, gave military counsel, predicted the outcome of battles, wrote on military tactics, or performed extraordinary feats which led to victories.[101]

Inventions and discoveries (εὑρίσκειν) were infallibly conducive to fame.[102] Predictions made by the philosophers were among the most interesting, valuable, and noteworthy of their achievements.[103] Versatility, learning, and authorship were also among the contributory causes to the eminence of the philosophers.[104] Thales already had the reputation of being unusually versatile: he was a politician, natural philosopher, astronomer, mathematician, writer, oil-

[98] III 38 VIII 78, etc. I 39, 79 IV 21 V 16, etc.

[99] I 51, 112, 99, 110 II 19, 25, 32 VII 28, 98 I 120 VIII 51, 60, 67, 79.

[100] VIII 3 I 25 II 140 VIII 64, etc. On rhetorical achievements, see note 77.

[101] II 22 I 26, 115, 101, 47, etc.

[102] Inventions, I 105 II 1 III 48 VIII 57 IX 25, 53 I 11, 5. Discoveries, I 23 V 17 VIII 12 II 16 VII 30 II 111 IX 70. See also II 113, 134 IV 37 V 34.

[103] I 6, 7, 68, 114 II 32 IX 39 II 10 I 23, 114, 71, 115, 50 III 17 I 61 II 35, 45 VIII 90 V 5 II 10.

[104] V 21, 64, 80 VIII 79 IX 37 — I 28, 89 V 65 — II 57 VII 180, 189 X 26 V 80 VIII 15.

king, engineer, and athletic enthusiast.[105] Philosophical renown was won by teaching moral lessons, defending the tradition in which one had been reared, founding a school, having eminent disciples, or excelling in some branch of philosophy or in controversy.[106]

Above all, those who were the "first" to utter a saying or a doctrine or to perform an action gained for themselves a place among the immortals. Diogenes Laertius would have us believe that the Greeks made much of their opportunity of saying and doing things "first." Thirteen or more of such achievements were credited by him to Thales, Protagoras, and Plato each.

Like the barbarians, the Greeks had their first philosophers: Musaeus, or Linus, or Thales, or Anaximander, or Pythagoras.[107] Various first achievements stood out in the history of several of the philosophical schools, such as the innovation of Chrysippus, who "first lectured in the open air in the Lyceum."[108] First writings of various kinds are ascribed to ten of the philosophers, and among other first achievements in writing was the first dialogue written by Plato, the *Phaedrus*, the subject of which "has about it something of the freshness of youth."[109] Zeno of Citium was the first to divide philosophy into its three traditional branches, the first representatives of which were Thales, Socrates, and Plato (or Zeno of Elea), respectively.[110] In physics the first achievements were mainly of the Ionians, Pythagoreans, and Eleatics, Archelaus being the first to bring natural philosophy from Ionia to Athens.[111] Pioneers

[105] I 23, 24, 26, 27, 37, 38, 39.
[106] VI 78 V 41 VII 174 IV 23 V 31 II 134, etc.
[107] I 1–5, 22, 12, 13.
[108] III 24, 25 IV 28, 60 VI 2, 13, 14, 22 VII 185.
[109] I 3, 116 II 11, 48, 112 III 48 VII 25 VIII 83, 85 — IV 52 IX 54 III 118, 38.
[110] VII 39 I 24, 18 III 56.
[111] I 116 II 6, 11, 16, 17 VIII 48, 83, 85 IX 19, 21.

in astronomy were Thales, Solon, Anaximander, Pythagoras, Parmenides, etc.; in mathematics, Thales, Euphorbus, Moeris, Pythagoras, and Archytas, the last of whom first brought mechanics into a system; in practical spheres, Speusippus, who first rendered fagots portable, the Pythagoras who first boxed scientifically, etc.[112] In theology, first writings on the gods, first teachings concerning the soul, and the first application of purifications to houses and fields are noted.[113] In ethics, Socrates first discoursed on the conduct of life, Plato first acceptably defined the good, Zeno first employed the word *καθῆκον*, etc.; in politics, Chilon or Lycurgus first appointed ephors, Periander first had a bodyguard and changed his government into a tyranny, etc.[114] The followers of Euclides were the first dialecticians, besides whom others are singled out for special mention in dialectic who first employed such arguments as the Achilles and the like, or who first employed certain dialectical methods such as that of asking and answering questions, etc. Arcesilaus was the first to suspend judgment.[115] Plato was the first to study the significance of grammar, Protagoras the first to distinguish the tenses of verbs, Anaxagoras the first to interpret Homer ethically.[116] Protagoras was the main first performer in rhetoric, Aristotle being represented among the others because he was the first to write a speech in his own defense.[117] Among the first to have certain unusual experiences were: Socrates, the first martyr-philosopher; Plato, the first Athenian to set foot on the

[112] I 22–24, 27, 58 II 1 IV 60 VIII 14 IX 23 — I 25 VIII 11, 83 — I 3 IV 2 VIII 12, 14, 47 IX 53.

[113] I 3, 43, 116 I 24 VIII 14 IX 19.

[114] II 20 III 79 VII 25, 108, 37, 87 VIII 10 — I 45, 58, 68, 98.

[115] II 106, 110 IX 23, 29, 53 II 112 VI 3 IX 20 III 24, 79 IX 53 II 123 IV 28 IX 51.

[116] III 25 IX 52 II 11 IV 2.

[117] IX 51–54 V 9 III 25 II 20 VIII 57 IV 2.

island Aegina; and Arcesilaus, the first to attend a performance where seats were paid for.[118] Verily, "there is considerable advantage in being named first by an authority. If you were not first before you may be first forever after."[119]

No less than forty-five of the philosophers treated by Diogenes Laertius had no first achievements recorded for them, and little or nothing is said about the fame of some twenty-five of the philosophers. But the achievements that are recorded were conceived for the most part in ethical, doctrinal, and practical terms, and they were merely noted, not accounted for or explained.

Marks of honor. — Visible tokens of the esteem in which philosophers were held took such forms as decrees, bestowal of citizenship, political office, prizes, crowns and garlands, public funerals, and tombs and statues, 360 statues having been made for Demetrius in three hundred days (though these were later destroyed).[120] Among the terms used by Diogenes Laertius to designate the high regard in which his philosophers were held were *τιμᾶσθαι*, *ἐπαινοῦσθαι*, *ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι*, *δεινός*, and *θαυμάζεσθαι*. Thus Socrates commended Aeschines for "honoring" him, "praise" was meted out to Bias by Heraclitus though the latter was hard to please, "encomia" were composed by Epicurus for those who published his esoteric doctrines, Bias was "formidable" in pleading, and not a few of the philosophers were regarded as "marvels" (Stilpo, e.g., who was stared at by the multitudes).[121]

Nor was the ultimate in glorification denied to Diogenes' philosophers, for a goodly number of them were deified,

[118] II 20 III 19 IV 38 VIII 88 I 114.
[119] Woodbridge, "Philosophy," in *Greek Literature*, 209.
[120] VII 11, 29 IX 65 I 75 VIII 90 I 73 V 41, 75, 77, 82, etc.
[121] II 60 I 88 X 5 I 84 II 119, etc.

sharing honors in this respect with Alexander the king and Zamolxis the slave.[122] Divine honors were bestowed on Epimenides after his long sleep, on Menedemus for his wonder-working, on Pythagoras after his return from Hades, on Empedocles for his teaching and healing gifts, on Democritus for his predictions, and on Pyrrho for his peace of mind. In the company of the sons of gods were Hephaestus, Linus, Cleobulus, Plato, Asclepius, and Pythagoras. The last named was worshiped as Apollo by his followers because of his dignified bearing. Arcesilaus venerated his Academic teachers as gods or a remnant of the golden age.[123] No such honors are ascribed by Diogenes to Epicurus (as had been done by Lucretius) or to any of the Stoics or Peripatetics — except perhaps in explaining the name of Theophrastus, which had been given him "because of his graceful style" — but mainly to Platonic and Pythagorean philosophers. Pythagoras himself is said, however, to have given directions concerning the supreme honors to be paid to the gods alone, and Alcmaeon and Plato to have credited the full possession of the truth to the gods alone.[124]

His Classifications of the Philosophers

The eulogistic basis. — The merits of the philosophers are shown also in the ways in which Diogenes Laertius classified them. Philosophers may be divided, according to Diogenes Laertius, into dogmatists and Skeptics and into such as had left writings behind them and such as had not, and they are

[122] IX 60 VIII 2.

[123] I 110 VI 102 VIII 14, 21, 41, 62 IX 39, 65 — I 1, 4, 89 III 2, 45 VIII 4 — VIII 11 IV 22. See also VI 77 V 38 VII 170 VIII 68 V 90, 91.

[124] VIII 23, 24, 27, 33, 83 IX 72.

grouped in the book according to the schools to which they belonged.

Dogmatists and Skeptics. — Dogmatic philosophers are "such as make assertions concerning things as knowable," while Skeptics are "such as withhold judgment concerning things as incomprehensible." As a legislator lays down laws, so a dogmatist in philosophy lays down positive dogmas. The controversy whether Plato was a dogmatist or not is settled by Diogenes Laertius in the *dictum* that "where he has a firm grasp Plato expounds his own view and refutes the false one, but if the subject is obscure he suspends judgment." In the controversy over the inclusion of the Skeptics among the sects Diogenes Laertius favored a mediating position. The Skeptics were not a sect in the sense of holding positive dogmas, but were a sect in the sense of following, or seeming to follow, with regard to appearance, some principle. An extensive account is given in the chapter on Pyrrho of the controversy between the Skeptics and the dogmatists.[125]

Writers and non-writers. — Philosophy being a system of fixed doctrines, the philosophers who had left writings in which they had laid down their doctrines were worthy of special esteem and to be distinguished from those who had left no writings. About ten are listed in the prologue as having failed to write, and approximately an equal number are added to them in the body of the work. Discrepancies, however, occurred in at least four instances; namely, in the comments made by Diogenes Laertius on the writings of Theodorus, Stilpo, Menedemus, and especially Pythagoras, all of whom had been included among the non-writers in the prologue.[126]

[125] I 16 III 51, 52 I 20 IX 102–108.

[126] I 16, 23, 106 II 16, 84 IV 59 VI 96 VIII 79, 84 IX 30, 58 II 97, 120, 140, 142 VIII 6.

The writers among the philosophers and among their namesakes numbered sixty each. Catalogues were made of the books written by thirty-two of the philosophers, including all the Stoics treated. Such lists were in several instances said to have been preserved because of the excellence of the writings or of the writers.[127] The number of writings composed by the individual philosophers was an item to be included in a just appraisal of the work the respective philosophers had performed. Already in the prologue Melissus, Parmenides, and Anaxagoras, who had written but one treatise each, are contrasted with six philosophers who had written " many " and whose names are arranged according to the number of writings they had composed. In the main body of the book eight of the philosophers are credited with " a large number of works," and the number of the writings of twenty others is definitely indicated from Philolaus, who wrote but one book, to Chrysippus, the rival of Epicurus in voluminous authorship, to whom 705 writings are attributed.[128] Also the number of words and lines written had a bearing on the estimate to be formed of the philosophers. Thus Chrysippus wrote five hundred lines a day. The number of ἔπη counted varied from two hundred in the case of Thales to from four thousand to 6,500 in the case of Epimenides, and the στίχοι from the twenty thousand credited to Timon to the 445,270 credited to Aristotle. The number of the line is also given at which a quotation from Zeno and two from Chrysippus occurred. The eulogistic motive, which was as prominent in the bibliographical data amassed by Diogenes Laertius as in other respects, is illustrated in the tributes paid to Demetrius of Phalerum, who " in the number of his works

[127] V 22, 42 VII 174, 189. On Plato's writings, see H. Usener, " Unser Platontext," in *Göttinger Nachrichten,* 1892, 209–12.

[128] I 16 — IV 4, etc. — VIII 85 VII 180, 198 X 26, 27, etc.

and their total length in lines surpassed almost all contemporary Peripatetics," and to Zeno, who in his numerous writings " has spoken as has no other of the Stoics." [129]

Different modes of classification were employed by Diogenes Laertius in his catalogues of books. Plato's dialogues were classified according to subject, method, and bibliographical arrangement, the works of Crates and of Chrysippus according to the types of materials in them, those of Antisthenes in groups of four, those of Epicurus according to the three branches of philosophy, etc.[130] The subjects of the writings of the philosophers which are referred to by Diogenes Laertius outside of the catalogues of books include history, military science, drama, amatory subjects, philosophy, physics, ethics, politics, dialectic, astronomy, cosmology, theology, commentaries, and especially controversial writings and dialogues.[131] The works of the namesakes of the philosophers were chiefly poetical, rhetorical, geographical, and biographical, and also included tragedy, comedy, politics, military science, legends, astronomy, genealogy, history, etc.[132] Indeed, so close is the correspondence between the types of books (including sources) referred to by Diogenes Laertius and his classification of philosophical materials as to suggest the likelihood that his bibliographical interests determined his philosophical interests and that the cataloguing and reading habits of the Alexandrian bibliophiles had set the fashion with respect to the classifications and terms in which the history of philosophy was treated.

Certainly, Diogenes Laertius had a strong bibliographical

[129] VII 181 I 34, 111 IX 111 V 27 VII 37, 187, 188 V 80 VII 38, etc. See F. Ritschl and H. Usener, " Stichometrisches bei Diogenes Laertius," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XIII (1858), 309–15.

[130] II 61 III 49, 50, 57, 62 IV 23 VI 15 VII 189 IX 46, 110 X 30.

[131] II 52, 50, 110 VII 32 I 21 V 86 VII 25, 32 II 111 I 23, 4, 3 VIII 89 II 109, 105, etc.

[132] II 103, 17, 3, 3, 103, 59, 64, 103, 59 V 94 I 115 VI 101, etc.

interest. The word γράφειν and derivatives from it occur frequently throughout his work. A bookish atmosphere pervades his entire document. He had searched "the bibliographers who wrote on the titles of books." He was informed on such bibliographical details as the meaning of the critical marks affixed to the works of Plato, the double titles given for each of Plato's works, the cost of the Pythagorean treatises and other works, and the passages expunged from and later restored in the works of Zeno. He knew to whom some of the philosophers had dedicated some of their works. He could tell of books that had been owned and read by them as, e.g., the mimes of Sophron found under Plato's pillow. He was able to identify some treatises by the words with which they began.[133]

Diogenes Laertius was very desirous of distinguishing clearly between the genuine, doubtful, and spurious works of the philosophers, as in the case of the various Socratic dialogues and the dialogues of Phaedo. He noted the supposedly true authors of works falsely ascribed to some of the philosophers such as the books written "for a joke" by Dionysius and Zopyrus and made over by them to Menippus "as a person able to dispose of them advantageously."[134] The stories of some of the more deliberate forgeries are related to us, as that of Arcesilaus, who was caught revising some works of Crantor. The name of Plato occurs prominently among those the genuineness of whose writings is discussed, presumably because of the opposition engendered by the Academics through their reverence for the originality of their master. To the credit of Xenophon it is recorded that he published the history which made

[133] VII 188 — III 66, 57 IX 23 I 48 III 9, 56 IV 5 IX 113 VII 34 — II 61, 110 IV 38 VII 185 VIII 60 — II 22 III 18 IV 5, 33 V 62 VI 31 — III 37 VI 81 VII 41, 55, 188 VIII 6, 83, 85 IX 51, 57, etc.

[134] II 64, 105, 124 VI 100, etc.

Thucydides famous though he was in a position to appropriate it to his own use. As evidence for the genuineness of philosophical writings Sotion and similar authorities are cited, the *Republic* of Chrysippus is appealed to for proof of the genuineness of Zeno's *Republic*, and the marginal notes in the memoirs of Epicharmus are alluded to in proof of the genuineness of these memoirs.[135] If the genuineness of a philosopher's writings was not called in question, his originality was frequently attacked in charges of plagiarism. Thus, e.g., Plato is said to have imitated Sophron, drawn from Epicharmus, and transcribed the *Timaeus* from Philolaus, and Epicurus borrowed from Theodorus and drew from the *Tripod* of Nausiphanes, though by way of defense it is claimed that the writings of Epicurus contained no quotations.[136]

Stories are related of the manner in which some of the books had been written. Thus Plato's *Laws* were left on waxen tablets, Zeno's *Republic* was written (it was said in jest) " on Cynosura " or " holding on by the dog's tail," and Timon stopped writing when he was disturbed by maidservants and dogs.[137] The writings of the philosophers were read to interested audiences, Timon having been so careless in the preparation of his manuscripts that he had to recite " whatever came handy."[138] The fortunes of many books are recounted as, e.g., of the works of Heraclitus which were considered obscure by Socrates and by Crates.[139] Of the writings of Crantor and of Chrysippus the most famous

[135] II 61 IV 32 V 92 III 37, 57, 62 VIII 85 IX 37 (See notes 55 and 56) II 57 VII 33 VIII 78.

[136] II 18 III 18, 36 VIII 85 VII 180, 181 VIII 8, 56, 89 IX 38, 113 II 97 X 14, 26.

[137] III 35 VII 4, 181 IX 113 II 56, 112 III 34 IV 30 VI 84 VII 181 IX 113.

[138] IX 18, 39, 114 III 35, 37.

[139] IX 12 II 2, 22, 106 III 18 IV 31, 33, 62 VIII 58.

are singled out. Among other famous books were the Pythagorean books purchased by Plato and referred to at least four times by Diogenes, and the book of Heraclitus, the fame of which produced the sect called the Heracliteans.[140]

Only exceptionally is any attempt made briefly to indicate the contents of philosophical works as in the case of Aristotle's logical writings and the three treatises of Pythagoras. From the writings of the Pyrrhoneans we may learn "the whole of their mode of inference," and the dialogues of Plato are correctly interpreted if we explain the meaning of every statement in them, point out its purpose (whether doctrinal or controversial, whether primary or illustrative), and examine its truth.[141] A number of brief direct quotations are introduced, especially from Solon and from Skeptical utterances of the philosophers.[142] Other typical direct quotations include the advice of Pittacus concerning marriage, the prediction of Epicharmus that he would have an imitator, the lines of a Demetrius on the envious, the divine claims of Empedocles, etc.[143] Writers are supposed by Diogenes Laertius to reveal their moral characteristics in their writings: Plato his jealousy, Antisthenes his persuasiveness, Chrysippus his arrogance, Empedocles his boastfulness and selfishness, Heraclitus his loftiness, and Democritus his character.[144]

The philosophers revealed their character also in their letters, testaments, laws, poems, and songs. No less than thirty-one letters have been preserved from the correspon-

[140] IV 27 VII 187 III 9 VIII 15, 84, 85 IX 6.

[141] V 29 VIII 9 IX 102 III 65.

[142] I 47, 48, 49, 51 IX 71–73, 73–76.

[143] I 80 III 17 V 85 VIII 66. See also I 108 III 40 IV 26, 52 V 9 VI 85 VII 26, 85, 128 VIII 6, 36, 54, 76, 77 IX 1, 19, 22, 36, 37, 38.

[144] II 60 VI 14 VII 185 VIII 66 IX 1, 38.

dence of the sages and of the philosophers, there being in addition some thirty-six references to letters and collections of letters. The sages in their correspondence spoke of their hatred and fear of the tyrants (especially of the tyrants Pisistratus and Periander), the wealth of Croesus, the activity of Solon, their veneration for Thales, their proposed visits with one another and with the tyrants, their travels in different parts of the world, their annual meetings, and the glories of Greek civilization.[145] Plato's thirteen epistles, "which are ethical," are listed in accordance with the divisions of Thrasyllus and others; his mode of greeting is contrasted with that of Epicurus and of Cleon; brief references are made to a letter of Plato to Dion concerning the Pythagorean treatises, to an exchange of letters between Plato and the tyrant Dionysius, and to the letter of Archytas to Dionysius seeking pardon for Plato. The letters exchanged by Plato and Archytas concerning the writings of Ocellus are given in full.[146] The chief contents of the letters mentioned in Books IV to IX have to do with tyrants (the leading motif), politics, travel, testaments, books and learning, places of residence, and Greek culture.[147] Among the most important letters in Diogenes' book are the three which are quoted in full in Book X as containing epitomes of the doctrines of Epicurus. Special attention is paid to the epistle of Epicurus on pleasure and to the letters cited in defense of Epicurus as opposed to the letters on the basis of which charges had been made against Epicurus, some of the latter being characterized as spurious.[148] The letter of Telauges to Philolaus had been questioned by Neanthes, but when it

[145] I 44, 52, 64, 67, 53 II 4, 50 I 43, 99, 105, etc.

[146] III 61 X 14 III 9, 20, 22 VIII 79, 79–81.

[147] IV 2, 65 VI 44 VII 7, 8 IX 13, 14 — II 140 VIII 49 — VII 6–9 VIII 1, 87 — IV 44 — V 37 VIII 79–81 IX 13 — VI 23 VII 6 — IX 13.

[148] X 34, 84, 122, 137, 11, 13, 22, 3–8.

was found that Demetrius of Magnesia had discredited a letter of Epimenides to Solon, Diogenes Laertius was quick to supply another![149]

Besides mentioning the three copies of the will of Arcesilaus and the collection of wills made by Ariston of Ceos, Diogenes Laertius has recorded the testaments of six of his philosophers: Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato, Lyco, and Epicurus.[150] Provision was made in these wills for the disposal of property, the emancipation of slaves, the care of descendants and of descendants of departed friends, the arrangement of funerals, the improvement of buildings, the progress of philosophic schools, and similar practical concerns.

Of the laws which the philosophers are said to have made, only one of Pittacus and several of Solon are quoted. Other framers of laws were the Egyptians, Menedemus, Pythagoras, Eudoxus, Parmenides, and Protagoras. Plato and Heraclitus, however, declined invitations to make laws. Even Solon expressed his distrust of laws, comparing them to spiders' webs and declaring them to be of no avail without right leaders and without such a resentment against crime among those not victims of it as would equal that of the victims of crime. Nevertheless, by the laws which they had made the philosophers had truly benefited their cities.[151]

Poems are said to have been written by seventeen of the philosophers in various styles and on different subjects, Solon having written on Salamis and Pisistratus, Linus on the creation, Anacharsis on the institutions of the Greeks and of the Scythians, Pythagoras on the universe, Emped-

[149] VIII 53, 54, 74 I 112.

[150] IV 43, 44 V 64 III 41 V 11, 51, 61, 69 X 16. See G. Bruns, "Die Testamente der Griechen," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* I, 3.

[151] I 76, 45, 55, 61, 59—I 11 II 125, 142 VIII 3, 86, 88 IX 23, 50—III 23, 78 IX 3—I 58, 61, 64—I 45 VIII 3, etc.

ocles on the invasion of Xerxes and on nature, Parmenides on nature, etc. Crantor deposited his poems under a temple, the poem of Empedocles was recited by a rhapsode and those of Xenophanes by himself, the discourse of Heraclitus was put into verse by Scythinus the satirical poet, and Hesiod, Xenophanes, Empedocles, and Parmenides committed their philosophic doctrines to verse.[152] Philosophers also composed " songs," many of which were " still sung," according to Diogenes Laertius. The " most popular " of the songs of Chilon, Pittacus, Bias, and Cleobulus are quoted. Paeans were composed by Socrates and Empedocles to Apollo, by Demetrius of Phalerum on recovering his sight, and by Aristotle to Hermias. A namesake of Xenocrates was a writer of songs, and Anaximander was ridiculed by the boys because of his poor singing.[153]

Diogenes Laertius, who had himself composed poems in all metres (Πάμμετρος), claimed for himself no little acquaintance with matters of style. The importance of style is indicated in a saying of Theophrastus, whose name had been given him on account of his graceful style and who declared an unbridled horse to be more trustworthy than a badly arranged discourse. The Stoics also included the subject of style in their philosophy.[154]

Diogenes distinguished between the different kinds of poets among the philosophers: Arcesilaus was satirical and outspoken; Heraclides wrote in the style of comedy and of tragedy and in the intermediate style of conversation; the writings of Xenophanes are in epic metre or are elegiacs or iambics; Timon wrote epics, satiric dramas, comedies, and tragedies besides obscene poems and *Silli* (employing,

[152] I 4, 46, 47, 50, 52, 61, 68, 78, 85, 89, 97, 101, 112 III 4, 5 IV 25, 30 VIII 7, 55, 56, 57, 59, 63, 66, 77 IX 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 110.

[153] I 71, 78, 85, 91—II 42 V 76 VIII 57 V 47—IV 15 II 1.

[154] V 40, 38 VII 59, 60.

in the last named, parody, dialogue, and monologue), etc.[155] Diogenes also called attention to the various dialects that had been used: Anaximenes wrote in Ionic, as did a namesake of Anaximander and of Bion; an Epimenides wrote in Doric; and Aristippus in Doric and Attic.[156] Those whose styles were compared with one another were Onesicritus and Xenophon, Crates and Plato, and Menippus and Meleager. Among the models of style were Gorgias and Lyco in rhetoric, and Aratus, who was taken for a model by Dionysius the renegade.[157] Diogenes Laertius commended the style of Anaximenes as simple and unaffected; of Anaxagoras as attractive and dignified; of Arcesilaus, Zeno, and Heraclitus as axiomatic and concise; of an Aristotle as graceful; of Heraclides as beautiful, excellent, and lofty; of Zeno as exact and earnest; of Herillus as vigorous; of Epicurus as forceful and original; of Empedocles as powerful; of Epicurus and of namesakes of Demetrius, Zeno, and Democritus as clear; of Zeno of Elea as intellectual; and of Sextus and Hermarchus as fine and excellent.[158] On the other hand, Diogenes condemned the style of Thales as affected; of Heraclitus as obscure; of Socrates as unskillful; of Aeschines as slovenly; of Stilpo as frigid; of Plato as ambiguous; of Lyco (in his writings) and Pythagoras as poor; and of Chrysippus as unsuccessful, gross, indecent, repetitious, and unoriginal.[159] A rhetorical style was ascribed to Aeschines, Bion, Lyco, Demetrius of Phalerum, and Antisthenes.[160] The dialogue form of writing received

[155] IV 33 V 86 IX 18, 111 IV 58 V 83.

[156] II 3, 3 IV 58 I 115 II 84.

[157] VI 84, 98, 99 II 63 V 65 VII 167.

[158] II 3, 6 IV 33 VII 15, 18 IX 7 V 35, 86 VII 15, 18, 165, 181 VIII 57 X 13 V 83 VII 35 IX 49, 116 X 25.

[159] I 36 IX 6, 16 II 22, 42, 60, 120 III 65 V 65 VIII 6 VII 180, 187, 180.

[160] II 63 IV 52 V 65, 82 VI 2.

the special attention of Diogenes Laertius, particularly in connection with Plato.[161]

Bion is invested with the peculiar honor of having one of his lines quoted as a specimen of his varied style (which may be considered comparable to giving a prospective buyer one brick as a specimen of the architecture of a house)! Diogenes Laertius, moreover, aimed to make his own book concise and pleasant to read, expecting at least portions of it (as his cross references seem to indicate) to be read several times.[162]

Representatives of schools. — The classification of the philosophers which provided the external framework for the book of Diogenes Laertius was that based on the respective schools to which the philosophers belonged. The barbarian philosophies and general questions relating to the beginnings, successions, divisions, and schools of Greek philosophy are disposed of in the prologue, in which the sages are also distinguished from the philosophers proper and the main outline of the book is supposed to be given. Greek philosophy is divided into two main branches: the Ionian, which began with Thales, and the Italian, which began with Pythagoras. In the former there are three successions. Of these, the first appears to be the main line. After the succession from Thales to Socrates and the Socratics had been made through Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, and Archelaus, the first line passed from Plato and the representatives of the Old Academy through the representatives of the Middle and New Academies to Clitomachus. The second line passed from Socrates through Antisthenes and the Cynics as well as the Stoics to Chrysippus. The third line, which is most briefly described in the prologue

[161] II 60, 123 III 24, 37, 38, 48, 79. On style see also II 56 III 17 IV 19.

[162] IV 52 — III 47 V 34 VI 69 VII 160, etc.

and most briefly discussed in the actual treatment, extended from Plato through Aristotle to Theophrastus. The Italian branch of philosophy constituted the fourth line, passing from Pherecydes, his pupil Pythagoras, and the latter's son Telauges through those who later came to be designated as the Eleatics and the Atomists to Nausiphanes and Naucydes and their pupil Epicurus.[163]

The division of Greek philosophy into an Ionian and an Italian branch was made by Diogenes Laertius as the author of a philosophical manual written in Greek and in a Roman world, and the arrangement whereby the successions were brought to their end in members of the Academic, Stoic, and Peripatetic schools and in Epicurus was in harmony with a regard for the four great schools of the period in which Diogenes wrote.

Three other lists of schools are given in the prologue. The first of them describes the schools according to the origin of their names. The second is a list of ten ethical schools, the founders of which are expressly given. In this list of founders the Academy is again divided into the Old, Middle, and New Academies. The four great schools occupy their due place among the ethical schools, the other six being composed of Socratics and a Dialectic school, all of whom were associated with the Academics. The third list of schools given in the prologue is a variant list of nine schools quoted from Hippobotus. The Pyrrhoneans do not appear in any of the lists, although Diogenes insists on recognizing them as a sect. A brief characterization of the Eclectic school of Potamo concludes the prologue.[164]

[163] Prologue, I 1–21. Outline, I 13–15.

[164] I 17–21. Other lists given in the book, besides the lists of schools in the prologue and the various lists of the namesakes and the writings of the philosophers, are lists of barbarian philosophers, the sages, the Socratics, the disciples of Aristippus, the successors

Of the ten ethical schools the Cynic, Elian, and Dialectical were omitted by Hippobotus, who also separated the Annicerean and Theodorean schools from the Cyrenaic, followed a different order, and in expressly naming the Old Academy ignored the Middle and New Academies. The list based on the origin of the names of the schools contains seven names not included in the ten ethical schools. In the former list dialectic is characterized as "verbal jugglery" in distinction from the characterization of dialectic in the following section (just before the latter list) as concerned with "processes of reasoning." From this difference it has been concluded by Schmidt[165] that the former list had originally been written by a Skeptic together with the preceding paragraph, in which philosophers were divided into dogmatists and Skeptics and into writers and non-writers. Again, the question has been raised by Schmidt[166] how dialectic could have begun with Zeno of Elea if dialectic is concerned with "the processes of reasoning employed by both" physics and ethics, since ethics did not start, according to Diogenes, until Socrates? This discrepancy is further complicated by the designation of Clitomachus as the founder of the Dialectical school.

The Dialectical school of Clitomachus is not mentioned in the life of its alleged founder at the close of Book IV of the work, nor do the Eudaemonists, Philalethians, Elenchthecists, and Analogetics, whose names are explained in the prologue, appear in the main body of the work. On the other hand, a number of schools are ignored in the

---

of Euclides, the disciples of Plato, the succession of teachers and pupils among the Skeptics, the disciples of Epicurus, and the critics of Socrates and of Epicurus. (I 1, 41 II 47, 86, 112 III 46 IX 116 X 22 II 46 X 3.)

[165] Schmidt, *Studia Laertiana*, 23.

[166] Schmidt, *op. cit.*, 25.

prologue to whom consideration is given later; viz., the Olympian school unsuccessfully inaugurated by Alexinus, the school of the Heracliteans, and the school of Oenopides, to which Democritus belonged.[167]

Nor does the actual treatment of the philosophic successions by Diogenes accord with the outline as given in the prologue. In Book IV Bion is placed between Arcesilaus and Lacydes.[168] The succession of Peripatetics is extended in Book V beyond Theophrastus, who is followed by Strato, Lyco, Demetrius of Phalerum, and Heraclides. Of the nine Cynics treated in as many chapters in Book VI only Antisthenes, Diogenes, and Crates are considered in the prologue. The heterodox Stoics Ariston, Herillus, and Dionysius as well as Sphaerus are treated in Book VII in addition to Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus. Pythagoras is the only philosopher discussed in Book VIII who is also considered in the prologue, and no extended treatment is given of Telauges. Nor does Telauges appear in the life of Empedocles in Book VIII as the teacher of Empedocles as he does in the life of Pythagoras, or in the life of Xenophanes in Book IX as teacher of Xenophanes as he does in the prologue. And in Book IX Parmenides, not Xenophanes, is treated as a pupil of the Pythagoreans.[169] Heraclitus and Xenophanes, the former of whom was ignored and the latter of whom was included in the Pythagorean succession in the prologue, are characterized as "sporadic philosophers"[170] and are followed by other unclassified philosophers, three of whom the prologue had included in the Italian succession (Zeno of Elea, Leucippus, Democritus). Book IX concludes with an account of the Skeptics, whom Diogenes had characterized as a sect in the prologue and whose doctrines and successions he recounts in Book IX despite the association

[167] II 109 IX 6, 41.
[168] See Chapter II, note 34.
[169] VIII 50, 42 I 15 IX 21.
[170] VIII 50, 91 IX 20.

of the Skeptics with the "Sporadics." In Book X only Nausiphanes, but not Naucydes, is given as a teacher of Epicurus, and Hermarchus, Polystratus, Dionysius, and Basilides are named as successors of Epicurus.[171]

Peculiar difficulties are presented in the Laertian treatment of the Socratics. In the passage on the Socratics after the account of Socrates (II 47) Plato is mentioned first, although Xenophon is the first actually to be treated at length by Diogenes. Plato is also named last as the founder of the ten (ethical) schools, although four of these schools (the Cyrenaics, Elians, Megarians, and Eretrians) are discussed before Plato. No reason is indicated why Plato, Xenophon, and Antisthenes are selected as "the chief of the Socratics." Of these, Plato and Antisthenes are reserved for later treatment with the Academics and Cynics, respectively, and Xenophon is inserted between Socrates and the "Socratics proper." The "Socratics proper" appear to have been ten in number. Schmidt supposes[172] that the passage on the Socratics (II 47) is a combination of excerpts from a writer on the Socratics and from a writer on sects, that the expression τῶν δὲ φερομένων δέκα refers to the list of ten schools (not to a traditional list of ten Socratics as the Hicks translation suggests), and that the selection of the "four most distinguished" of these schools (represented by Aeschines, Phaedo, Euclides, and Aristippus) was made by way of parallel to the well-known later four great schools of philosophy. Diogenes does not, however, observe the order in which these "four most distinguished" schools (or Socratics)[173] are named, for he

[171] X 13 I 15 X 25.

[172] Schmidt, *Studia Laertiana,* 32. See also Gercke, "Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik," in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Litteratur,* VII (1901), 81 f.

[173] Cf. Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* I, 176, note a.

takes up Aristippus immediately after Aeschines. In the chapter on Aristippus the use of the perfect tense in the reference to the account of Plato seems to indicate that originally Plato had come before Aristippus. Later in the same chapter the pupils of Phaedo, "the chief of whom were called the school of Eretria," were associated with the Cyrenaics, who "sprang from" Aristippus.[174] But in reality Euclides and those who were presumably regarded as the minor Socratics are placed between Phaedo and Menedemus, the founder of the Eretrian school. Menedemus, as the founder of a school (II 105), is taken up at the end of Book II. In the transition from Antisthenes to the Cynics and the Stoics (IV 19) Diogenes alluded to his discussion of the pupils of Aristippus and to Phaedo only, thus ignoring all the philosophers he had treated from Euclides to the end of Book V.

Such discrepancies in the very plan of the book of Diogenes Laertius mark the document as a compilation very carelessly thrown together by a collector who took over, in the form of notes loosely strung together, not only the materials of others, but also fragments of their outlines and transitional sentences or phrases, though modifying them by his own corrections.

The designation of philosophers by their schools became a veritable "label" with Diogenes Laertius.[175] Especially in the case of the namesakes of the philosophers such a "label" often furnished the only clue given for purposes of identification. It is interesting to note that with one exception the namesakes identified or labeled in this manner belonged to one of the four great schools claiming the main interest of Diogenes and his readers, there being designated among the namesakes three Academics, seven

[174] II 65, 85. Cp. II 105.
[175] II 105, 106 X 14, etc.

Peripatetics, one Cynic, six Stoics, and one Epicurean.[176] Designation by schools was a common device employed also with respect to other groups. Thus there were rhetoricians of the school of Isocrates, physicians of the school of Herophilus, Hicesius, and the Empirics, and a grammarian of the school of Zenodotus.[177]

Among the outstanding facts in the fortunes of the schools emphasized by Diogenes Laertius were the migration of the Socratic circle to Megara after the death of Socrates, the names by which the Elians and the Megarians came to be called, the meddling of Arcesilaus with the system of Plato, the derivation of the Peripatetics from Plato, the derivation of the most manly section of the Stoic school from Antisthenes, the philosophizing of Chrysippus in the Academy, the lapsing of the school of Timon until its reëstablishment by Ptolemy of Cyrene, and the survival of the Epicurean school after all the rest.[178] Many of these items clearly reveal the eulogistic strain running through the Laertian treatment of the philosophers according to the schools to which they belonged.

Diogenes Laertius as Encomiast

The motive of the book. — The recognition of the laudatory viewpoint from which the philosophical history of Diogenes Laertius was written appears to be essential to an understanding and appreciation of the book. The eulogistic motive controlled the various conceptions of philosophy entertained by the author, who regarded philosophy as a vital enterprise, an educative process, a moral influence, a tradition to be conserved and defended, a product of great

[176] II 64, 83 IV 23 II 47 III 109 IV 23, 23 V 61, 83 VII 164 IV 23 II 104, 104, 104 V 83 VI 81 IX 56 VII 35.

[177] II 15 IV 23, 5 VII 35 V 94, 94 II 15.

[178] II 105, 106 IV 28, 59 VI 14 VII 184 IX 115 X 9.

antiquity, a Greek invention, and a subject for eulogy in view of its superiority to poetry and art, rhetoric and sophistic, religion, ordinary and scientific knowledge, and ordinary modes of life. The philosophers whose memory was preserved in Diogenes' book were chosen for their eminence, to which they had attained by various types of achievement and evidence for which had been given in various marks of honor that had been bestowed on the philosophers. In his grouping of the philosophers in whom he was interested Diogenes considered the dogmatists as more constant than the Skeptics, placed the writers above the non-writers, and traced the development of the four great schools held in esteem in his day.

Interpretations of the author's preferences. — Students of Diogenes Laertius have not been unanimous in their conclusions regarding the personal preferences of Diogenes Laertius. Casaubon, Menagius, Gassendi, and other writers listed by Longolius, as well as Zevort, Maass, Wilamowitz, and Gercke have viewed him as an Epicurean; Gercke, Schwartz, and Schmidt have considered him a Skeptic; and " a certain learned man " alluded to by Menagius has even maintained that he was a Christian.[179]

Wilamowitz found it significant that Diogenes had dedicated an entire book each to Plato and to Epicurus, to the former because the lady to whom the book was dedicated was a Platonist, to the latter because he himself was probably an Epicurean. Zevort sought traces of the Epicureanism of Diogenes Laertius in the enthusiastic defense of Epicurus, in the epigram of Diogenes on Epicurus, and in the phrase which introduces the *Sovran Maxims:* " using for

[179] Zevort ed., xiv; Longolius ed., 23–27; Wilamowitz, in *Hermes,* XXXIV (1899), 633; Gercke, *De Quibusdam Laertii Diogenis Auctoribus,* 8, 61, 67; Schwartz, in Pauly-Wissowa, V, 1 (1905), 761–63; Schmidt, *Studia Laertiana,* 2, 3.

the end [of the book] the beginning of happiness." Nietzsche, however, called attention to the sarcasm in the epigram on Epicurus and declared that the defense of Epicurus had been copied out of Diocles; Fabricius and Brucker maintained that a mere defense of Epicurus does not constitute one an Epicurean; and Longolius pointed out that Seneca had frequently lauded Epicurus.[180] For the Skepticism of Diogenes Laertius Gercke argued from the supplementation of the supposed Academic source book by the Skeptical writer Hippobotus, Schwartz from the extended treatment given of the Skeptics, and Schmidt from the contumely heaped upon all philosophers alike by Diogenes Laertius, who wrote as a "Lucianus alter" and ascribed to the Skeptics the power of defending themselves against the Stoics and the dogmatists in general.[181] A single phrase, in which Aristotle is said to have "given alms" to a bad man (V 17), was the basis for the supposition that Diogenes was a Christian. Zevort refutes this contention in all seriousness by showing that ἐλεημοσύνην ἔδωκεν may have become a current expression, and Menagius observes that one who praised Epicurus could not have been a Christian.[182]

From the ridicule meted out to Pythagoras in a number of epigrams, Diels concluded that Diogenes was certainly not a Pythagorean.[183] In the view of Delatte, Diogenes dispensed his sympathies equally to all, though according special interest to the Skeptics, great respect to Plato, and an enthusiastic defense to Epicurus. Diogenes manifested

[180] X 9–11, 16, 138. Nietzsche, *Werke,* XVII, 177; *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIII (1868), 641; Longolius ed., 27.

[181] VII 32, 187 IX 70.

[182] Zevort ed., xix; Menagius, in Huebner, *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium,* I, 149.

[183] VIII 44, 45. Diels, in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie,* III (1890), 452.

sympathy for some, interest in all, and hostility towards none.[184] In the judgment of Schwartz, Diogenes was repelled only by such " charakterlose Witzbolde " as Bion and Menippus or Heraclides, whom Diogenes — in conformity with the tradition — regarded as a charlatan.[185] Freudenthal had, however, regarded Diogenes, not as an Eclectic, but as more akin to such opponents of philosophical syncretism as Aenesidemus and Numenius.[186] Despite the lengthy exposition of the doctrines of the Stoics and the constantly recurring emphasis on Plato, no scholars have looked upon Diogenes as a Stoic or a Platonist. In the view of Nietzsche and Delatte,[187] the opinions of Diogenes Laertius are to be sought not in his doctrinal accounts, but in the epigrams of which he was the author. Gercke has called attention to a number of passages in which Diogenes Laertius — or rather the Platonic author of his main source book — has expressly stated his own opinions.[188]

His admiration of Plato and of Epicurus. — The personal preferences of Diogenes Laertius may, however, be learned best from the way in which he arranges and emphasizes his materials. Comparatively scant attention is paid by Diogenes to Aristotle and the Peripatetics. Cynicism, it is suggested, may be but a mode of life rather than a philosophy. The story of Heraclides Ponticus concerning the first use of the term philosophy by Pythagoras is opposed by the account of the *twofold* origin of philosophy and of its development into four great schools. Skepticism and Eclecticism come in for separate consideration in the prologue.

[184] Delatte, *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce,* 35, 39.

[185] Schwartz, *op. cit.,* 763.

[186] Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien,* III, 270.

[187] Delatte, *op. cit.,* 37; Nietzsche, *Werke,* XVII, 171.

[188] Gercke, *De Quibusdam Laertii Diogenis Auctoribus,* 40, 41. I 3–5 II 16, 45, 134 III 47 IV 15 V 57 VIII 6 IX 40.

Epicurus is cited verbatim and at length in order that the reader may be able "to study the man on all sides and know how to judge him." The reader is also commended for her enthusiastic Platonism.[189] Throughout the book the attempt is made to connect the various schools so far as possible with the Academics.[190] A special interest in Plato is manifested in the more than eighty references to Plato outside of Book III. In these references Diogenes expressed his desire to write the best possible account of Plato, pointed out the place of Plato in the philosophic succession, showed the friendly and inimical relations of Plato to others, traced the influence of Plato's teachings and of his writings, and referred to incidents of Plato's life, to the biography Diogenes had himself written of Plato, and to other admirers of Plato.[191]

Accordingly, the book of Diogenes Laertius presents itself as a eulogy of ancient Greek philosophers of the various schools, with a special interest in Epicurus and an even greater admiration for Plato and for Platonism.

[189] I 15 VI 103 I 12, 13–15, 16, 20, 21 X 29 III 47.

[190] I 14, 15, 18 II 47 IV 1 V 2 VII 163 VIII 15, 54, 55 85, 86 X 14, etc.

[191] IV 1 I 19 II 86, 57, 135 IV 32 V 9 II 57, 65 IV 5, etc. The principal cross references to Epicurus are II 88 IV 43 IX 101, 106; to the Cyrenaics, X 122–135; to the Stoics, VI 105.

Chapter IV

HIS BIOGRAPHIES

The Biographical Interests of Diogenes

The purpose to praise. — Diogenes' biographies are in harmony with the general purpose of his book to glorify the philosophers of old. From birth to death the philosophers led an existence that was for the most part exemplary and always notable and worthy of their eminence.

The philosophers emphasized. — For six of the philosophers treated there are no biographical materials in Diogenes, and on twenty-seven the biographical notes are very meagre.[1] But for others the biographical accounts are comparatively extensive, by far the most extended being that of Diogenes the Cynic, the rest including: Plato, Zeno of Citium, Socrates, Empedocles, Epicurus, Aristotle, Menedemus the Eretrian, Aristippus, Arcesilaus, Antisthenes, Thales, Pythagoras, Theophrastus, and Democritus. These were all heads of schools or men around whose names interesting stories had been woven.

Stories. — For Diogenes Laertius was fundamentally a story teller. Beginning with the account of the origin of the term "philosophy," the achievements of Thales, and the numerous versions of the story of the tripod in the account of the sages, and continuing down to the death of Epicurus, the book of Diogenes abounds in choice stories, many of a humorous and humble type, especially in the life of Di-

[1] II 6, 106, 124, 124, 125 VIII 84 — II 1, 3, 105, 121, 121, etc. For chronology see Chapter II, note 96.

ogenes the Cynic. The stories cover a wide variety of topics from the basest pornography to the naivest mythology. Burnet has, in his discussion of Heraclitus, illustrated the manner in which many of them may be supposed to have originated. Thus "Heraclitus said (fr. 68) that it was death to souls to become water, and we are told accordingly that he died of dropsy; etc." Strachey, impressed by the fragmentary and lowly character of the stories of Diogenes Laertius, has said of them: "Though the mixture of ignorance and carelessness which he constituted spoiled many of the stories, he gives us as a whole a wonderful picture of the Greek philosophers in their shirt-sleeves." Some of the narratives manifest such an astounding degree of credulity that Hicks in the bibliography in his edition of Diogenes Laertius listed a section of a magazine article by Cobet, who had illustrated this characteristic of Diogenes from the biographies of Socrates, Plato, and Xenophon, as treating *de Diogene Laertio fabularum pleno*.[2] The stories of Diogenes Laertius may therefore be deemed just as authentic as any anecdotes of the "cherry tree" variety.

Biographical rubrics. — Even the biographies as such give every indication of being apocryphal. The Laertian lives are characterized by the recurrence of nearly a score of fundamental strains running through the book, for the author has not succeeded in keeping his biographies free from the effects of his collecting and classifying habits. The topics according to which his biographical materials are arranged constitute so many rubrics into which his accounts have been made to fit. These categories may or may not have been applicable to the lives of the philos-

[2] Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophers,* 131; Strachey, in the *New York Times,* April 4, 1926, Section 3, p. 7; Hicks, *op. cit.,* xl; Cobet, in *Mnemosyne,* VII (1858), 52–55.

ophers, but by indicating what Diogenes Laertius regarded as important in the life of a philosopher they do reveal basic traits of his own mentality.

The Lives of the Philosophers

Birth and descent. — The lives of some of the philosophers began auspiciously. Socrates was born on the birthday of Artemis and Plato on the birthday of Apollo. For the birth of these two philosophers as well as of Epicurus the Olympiad, year, month, and day are recorded. While Bion was born in a brothel, Linus was the son of Hermes and the Muse Urania, and Plato was the son of Apollo according to a tradition at Athens reported from three different sources.[3]

Nine of the philosophers and a namesake are expressly declared to have been well-born. Only exceptionally was poverty associated with noble birth. As a rule, those not well-born were despised.[4] Noble birth was also taken up for consideration in the teachings of the philosophers. Socrates, the school of Hegesias, and the Cynics, especially Antisthenes and Diogenes, disparaged noble birth, Plato and Aristotle included it among the useful or necessary external goods, Bion valued it as making freedom of speech possible, and Cleanthes prized it as affording relief from toil.[5]

Diogenes recorded the name of at least one of the parents of his philosophers in all except twenty-two cases. For ten of the philosophers the name of the family or tribe is given, and the ancestry of Thales, Cleobulus, Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras is traced.[6]

[3] II 44 III 2 X 15 IV 46 1 4.

[4] V 1, 84, etc. — II 125 IX 21 — IV 35 VI 1, 4, 96 V 75.

[5] II 31, 94 VI 104, 1, 10, 72 III 78 V 30 IV 51 VII 172.

[6] I 82, 22, etc. See also I 101 II 31 IX 25.

Place-names. — Place-names were attached by Diogenes to all the philosophers to whom he devoted a chapter in his book as well as to eighty-nine of the namesakes and to many others. Thus a namesake of Plato is called "a philosopher of Rhodes," and in the list of nineteen of Plato's, and of eleven of Zeno's, disciples the name of a city is appended to the name of each person mentioned. The importance of the places from which the philosophers hailed is exemplified in Myson, who remained obscure because he had come from an obscure village, and in Zeno, who was not ashamed in Athens of having come from Citium. Fourteen of the philosophers had come from Athens, six from Miletus, six from Lampsacus, etc.[7]

Personal names. — The subject of personal names also assumed great importance in the mind of Diogenes. Plato had discoursed on the propriety of names. Many of the philosophers bore appropriate names, as Plato or Aristocles. Names were derived from a philosophy (Archelaus and Strato the Physicists), from the relations of their bearers to others (Euripides *σωκρατογόμφους*), from places (the Stoic Diogenes the Babylonian), or from writings (Xenophon the Attic Muse). Some philosophers bore two names, the original name being changed at times into one with a similar sound (Chrysippus into Crypsippus).[8] Special circumstances sometimes gave occasion for the use of nicknames (Apollodorus and Diodorus "Cronos"), many of which owed their origin to personal features of the philosophers (Plato, Ariston the Bald, Dionysius the Renegade). No less than eight nicknames were attributed to Pittacus, many stories revolved around the nickname of Diogenes *ὁ κύων*, and Timon punned on the name of Plato. Abusive names were frequently applied, especially by Di-

[7] III 109, 46 VII 36–38 I 108 VII 12 I 3, 22 II 11, etc.
[8] III 79, 4 II 16 V 58 II 18 VI 81 II 57 VII 182, etc.

ogenes and supposedly also by Epicurus, and were even borne with pride as by Cleanthes who " did not mind being called the ass " by his fellow-pupils since " he alone was strong enough to carry the load of Zeno." [9] Also the names of schools and of other groups are explained as well as the names of places such as the Academy, etc.[10]

Personal characteristics. — Diogenes collected many items concerning the physical, mental, moral, and social characteristics of his philosophers. The physical appearance of seventeen philosophers is described, including Carneades, who would let his hair and nails grow because of his intense application to philosophy. Various were the forms of exercise taken by the philosophers: Pittacus ground corn, Socrates danced, Plato wrestled, and Lyco and Crates were well practised in gymnastics. Various also were the qualities of the voice of the philosophers: Plato's was weak, Carneades' was so powerful that he had to be requested to refrain from shouting, and Plato in the *Protagoras* called Prodicus deep-voiced. The types of clothing worn by the philosophers likewise helped to characterize them. Thus Socrates wore fine clothes only on occasion, Aristotle made himself conspicuous, Lyco was immaculate, the Cynics wore distinctive garb, the attire of Empedocles was designed to be impressive, etc.[11]

While Menedemus shirked his work, other philosophers were industrious, Carneades and Democritus being so devoted to their studies that the former wrote more than four hundred treatises and the latter did not notice the ox his father had brought for him to sacrifice. Many of the

[9] II 111 III 4 VII 160, 166 I 81 VI 45 III 26 VI 24 X 8 VII 171, etc.

[10] VII 5 IV 58 III 7, etc.

[11] IV 62 — I 81 II 22, 32 III 4, 5 V 67 VI 91 — III 4 IV 62 V 1 IX 50 — II 28, 35, 40 V 1, 67 VI 22 VIII 19.

philosophers had received a good training in their youth. Some were fond of reading poetry. Menedemus is especially defended against the charge of having read the *Medea* of Euripides only. This Menedemus excelled in inventing objections. Cleanthes, however, had no aptitude for physics. Even the accomplishments of the namesakes are given. They became authorities on legendary marvels, on musical composers, on the Romans, on the Iliad, and on the Dorians.[12]

Morally, the philosophers exhibited traits of character that were suited to their high station. Zeno, e.g., was " a truly noble character both as philosopher and as politician." His character can be seen from his writings! Pyrrho in a storm at sea pointing to a pig in the ship eating was one of many examples used in stories illustrating calmness and self-possession. The philosophers were wont to behave in a dignified manner. The fellow-citizens of Empedocles recognized in him the stamp of royalty. Some of the philosophers were vain, Antisthenes affecting modesty by displaying the tear in his cloak. Plato, however, was so modest as never to have been seen in his youth to laugh outright. Many were magnanimous, and Xenocrates was so honest as to have been allowed to give evidence unsworn. Speusippus, however, was — unlike Plato — prone to anger and easily overcome by pleasure, for he threw his favorite dog into a well and made a journey to attend a wedding from the sole motive of pleasure. Self-examination was practised by Xenocrates, who more than once a day assigned a whole hour to silence.[13]

Nor are we left in the dark concerning the personal tastes and preferences of some of the philosophers. Xenophon

[12] II 130 IV 67 — II 63 III 3 — II 133, 134 VII 170 — II 59, 104 V 35 VIII 47.

[13] IX 26, 38, 68 VIII 56 VI 8 III 26 IV 37, 6, 1, 11, etc.

was fond of horses and of hunting, Arcesilaus of writing and of poetry, Theophrastus of discussion, Zeno of Citium of eating green figs and of basking in the sun, Dionysius the Renegade of literature, and Timon of wine.[14] A large number loved solitude, among them Myson, who was seen to laugh at himself in a lonely spot because according to his own admission no one was there, and Heraclitus, who became a hater of his kind, living in the mountains on a diet of grass and herbs. As against Chilon and Zeno of Citium, who were men of few words, Ariston and Antisthenes were given to verbosity, the latter being called by Xenophon "the most agreeable man in conversation and the most temperate in everything else." The philosophers bore ill usage patiently. Aristippus, Stilpo, and Zeno of Citium were able readily to adapt themselves to circumstances, an art which the Cynic Diogenes learned through watching a mouse run about. Some of the philosophers were independent, even when dealing with kings, and in various ways they showed their contempt for others. Heraclitus even won the praise of Anaxarchus for passing the latter by, when Anaxarchus was in a slough, without giving him any help.[15]

Marriage. — Whether the wise man should marry was an important question answered in the affirmative by Menedemus, Plato, and the Stoics and in the negative by the Epicureans. The Stoics argued for community of wives among the wise, which was practised by the Massegetae. Incest was permitted by the Magi and by Chrysippus and was practised by Periander.[16]

[14] II 56 IV 30 V 37 VII 1, 167 IX 110.

[15] I 107 IX 3, 63 I 72 VI 15 VII 18 II 46, 65, 116 VI 22 VII 12 II 24, 27 IX 28, 63.

[16] II 128 III 78 VII 121 X 119 VII 33, 131 IX 83 I 7, 96 VII 188 IX 83.

Advice was freely sought on the subject of marriage and as freely given, especially by the ancient sages. At times the philosophers were as noncommittal in their counsel as the oracles, an example being the answer of Socrates: "Whatever you do you will repent it." Not much more light was to be gained from the lives of the philosophers, for some of them married, others remained single, and concerning still others the traditions varied.[17] Interesting stories are told of the marriage of Pittacus, whose wife was superior to him in rank; of the daughter of Crates, who was given in marriage on trial for thirty days — according to Menander; of Pythagoras, whose wife was exceptional in that she wrote and uttered witty sayings; and of Menedemus and Asclepiades, the latter of whom (after the death of his wife) took the wife of the former, who in turn (after his second marriage) entrusted his first wife with the care of his establishment.[18] Pythagoras saw in Hades the punishment of those unfaithful to their wives, and Polemo became a faithful husband after his conversion to philosophy. In a number of instances we have reports of the children of the philosophers, but Arcesilaus had no children nor did Thales — *διὰ φιλοτεκνίαν* (or *δι' ἀφιλοτεκνίαν*?).[19]

Sex-life. — Many of the philosophers were known for the courtesans they kept. Among them were especially Aristippus, who defended his conduct in witty sayings, and Arcesilaus, who in defending himself quoted the maxims of Aristippus.[20] Diogenes Laertius was greatly interested in the sex-life of the philosophers. He records their teachings and sayings on the subject, especially the sayings of the Cynic

[17] I 69, 70, 80, 91, 92 II 33 IV 48 I 81, 94 II 26, 114 VI 93, 96 VIII 42 IV 43 I 26 V 3.

[18] I 81 VI 93 VIII 43 II 137.

[19] VIII 21 IV 48 VIII 42, 89 IV 43 I 26 II 81, etc.

[20] II 114 III 31 IV 40, 63 V 76 X 7, 23 II 67, 69, 74, 81 IV 40.

Diogenes and such advice as that of Thales to an adulterer that perjury is no worse than adultery. Nor does he fail to mention the opposition of Solon, Crates, and Pythagoras to profligacy.[21] Strachey says of our author: "His talk is always of ladies."[22]

Moreover, in the book of Diogenes Laertius, teachers and pupils, philosophers and tyrants, and friends and associates figure as lovers and intimates.[23] The assertions of sexual relations form a strain in the Hellenistic literature which goes back, according to Leo,[24] to the slanders of Aristoxenus and furnishes Diogenes Laertius with a topic for numerous sayings and stories of "love."[25] There was a cult of physical beauty among Laertius' philosophers; Zeno, among others, wrote on amatory subjects; and the place of the passions in the life of the wise man was discussed pro and con by the various schools.[26]

Social life. — The lives of the philosophers breathed a "familiar" and "homey" atmosphere. The word οἰκία and its derivatives are frequently used by Diogenes as he introduces us to the homes, households, relatives, and servants of the philosophers. Thus the sages conferred with one another as to where they should reside, the tyrant was considered happy who died a natural death in his own house, and we read of the house of Euripides in which Protagoras read his book on the gods, the house shared by

[21] II 105, 127 IV 7, 16, 46 VII 167 II 99 VII 33 X 118, 132 I 36 VI 3, etc. I 55 VI 9 VIII 20.

[22] Strachey, in the *New York Times,* April 4, 1926, Section 3, p. 7.

[23] III 29, 18, 25, 29, 30 IV 30, 41, etc.

[24] Leo, *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach Ihrer Litterarischen Form,* 102.

[25] VI 51, 62, 67, 86 IV 17, 24, 29, 40, 41, 53, etc.

[26] II 20 IV 4, 34 VII 21, 33 II 99 VI 11, 12, 105 VII 129 II 91 IV 34 V 31 VII 21, 113, 130 X 118.

Arcesilaus and Crantor and by Zeno and Persaeus, and other friends with whom and houses in which the philosophers lived, including the tub of Diogenes the Cynic. The philosophers provided for the care of their households, especially in their wills, and the housekeeping of Lacydes and of Pyrrho is described as "careless" and "indifferent." [27]

The social life of the philosophers is pictured in detail. We see them at dinners, banquets of political rulers, entertainments, weddings, festivals, races, and athletic contests. Especially the way in which Menedemus, who was fond of entertainments, gave his parties is described, and Xenophon is said to have hunted, entertained his friends, and worked at his histories without interruption! [28] Diogenes tells us what food the philosophers were fond of eating, not neglecting to inform us of the nymphs' food of Epimenides and of the dietary regulations of the Pythagoreans. Several of the philosophers indulged freely in drink, others were opposed to strong drink. While good speaking at dinners is said to belong to an education, the philosophers seemed to fail ingloriously at the point of making after-dinner speeches.[29]

Socrates and Zeno lived frugally, and Antisthenes condemned luxury, but Aristippus (and Bion) lived extravagantly, as we may learn from the words of Timon, who with a thrust at the Cyrenaic doctrine of sensation chid Aristippus for groping after error by touch! The names of some of the philosophers, however, went down in history for having declined invitations to dinner because of their in-

[27] I 44, 73 IX 54 IV 22 VII 13 VI 23 V 56 IV 59 IX 65, etc. Relatives were those *οἶκοι*, a servant was an *οἰκέτης* or a *πάροικος*, Theophrastus bequeathed his garden to such as would live there together *οἰκείως καὶ φιλικῶς*, etc. (IX 63 I 92, 82 V 53.)

[28] III 98 IX 58 II 76 III 2 VIII 53 I 39 II 138, 52, etc.

[29] I 113 VIII 19 IX 3 VII 26 I 76 V 40 I 69 II 112 VII 24.

dustry, easygoing nature, asceticism, or for other reasons. Particularly did Zeno " stand unspoiled by public feast and jollity," and when Pythagoras returned from a funeral to find his followers feasting he was so aggrieved that he ended his days by starvation.[30]

Friendships and enmities. — Some philosophers were famous for their friendships such as Menedemus, who was " a very warm friend." Among the details considered by Diogenes worthy of passing on to posterity were the notes that Arcesilaus " was on the best of terms with Hierocles the commandant in Munichia and Piraeus and at every festival would go down to see him " and that Timon " was not unknown to King Antigonus and to Ptolemy Philadelphus — as his own iambics testify." Pythagoras' great capacity for friendship, especially towards those who adopted his symbols, made many " into good men and true," and by virtue of the ethical value of the friendship of philosophers Diogenes could incorporate in his extended apologetic of Epicurus the fact that countless friends came to Epicurus from all parts.[31] Nor are the personal grudges of the philosophers forgotten. Democritus opposed the views of Anaxagoras on cosmogony and on mind because Anaxagoras did not take to him, and Anaxagoras in turn bore Democritus a grudge because Democritus failed to get into communication with him. Traces of their ill-will were left by the philosophers in their writings as when Plato excluded Aristippus from those who were present at the death of Socrates or when Xenophon and Plato failed to mention each other and when the two last named wrote books, those of the one author paralleling those of the other.[32]

[30] II 27 VII 27 VI 8 II 66, 99 IV 53, 63 IX 114 VI 57 VII 37 VIII 40.

[31] II 136 IV 39 IX 110 VIII 16 X 10. See also II 50 I 102, etc.

[32] II 14, 50, 57 IX 35 II 65 III 34, 36.

Many were the occasions when philosophers experienced the help of friends in difficult situations. Pericles defended Anaxagoras at the trial of the latter, Crito ransomed Phaedo, Arcesilaus nursed Hipponax, Menedemus provided an escort for the wife of Alexinus on a perilous journey, Heraclitus attacked the Ephesians for banishing his friend Hermodorus, etc. Another story has it that Antisthenes died just as Diogenes entered the room and asked him, "Have you need of a friend?" [33] Sayings on friendship abounded, such as Aristotle's "a friend is a single soul dwelling in two bodies," and "he who has friends can have no true friend." Advice was given concerning the gaining, treating, and keeping of good friends in all circumstances and in the right number, than which nothing was more important, whereas nothing was more disastrous than to have a foolish or unfaithful friend.[34] The various teachers and schools of philosophy endeavored to define, and to distinguish between the different species of, friendship and debated questions relating to proper motives for friendship, its reality in life or among the wise, and its obligations in the way of community of interests.[35]

Occupations. — Diogenes' philosophers did not ordinarily engage in lowly occupations which would have been out of harmony with their dignity, although Simon, in whose workshop Socrates discussed moral questions, was a cobbler and Menedemus the scene-painter was attacked when he proposed a decree "because the wise man was not a proper person to design a sign or a decree." [36] But philosophy en-

[33] I 71 II 13, 31, 105, 121, 136 III 20, 22 IV 32 V 39 VI 18, 75 VIII 79, 85, 86 IX 2, 20, 24, 62.

[34] V 20, 21 I 91, 37, 78 VI 29 I 87, 91, 37, 70, 97, 105 II 30 V 21 VII 124 X 148 VII 96 VI 68 I 87.

[35] V 31 VII 23, 124 III 81 V 31 II 91, 93, 96 VII 124 VI 72 VIII 10, 35.

[36] II 21, 122, 125.

abled one to rise from inferior to higher occupations and to the life of wisdom itself.

Many of the philosophers were active politically, among them Stilpo, whom Diogenes characterized as πολιτικώτατος, and the sages Periander and Pisistratus, who were tyrants. That Plato was a statesman Diogenes concluded — from his writings. Others among the philosophers gave up their political activities for their philosophic contemplations or assumed an attitude of cosmopolitanism from the outset.[37] Some of the philosophers are characterized as "legislators."[38] The military activities of the philosophers too are recorded, even when the philosophers merely wrote on tactics or when philosophy proved more attractive to them. Nor are the namesakes who were active in military affairs overlooked though nothing else was known of them, not excepting Epicurus the drill-sergeant.[39]

A goodly number of the philosophers were rhetoricians or wrote speeches and oratorical works, including reports of embassies. Timon even made a fortune as a Sophist.[40] The rhetoricians, among the namesakes, numbered twenty-one, of whom six wrote handbooks on rhetoric and four were known for their speeches.[41] Socrates and eleven namesakes of philosophers were sculptors.[42] Plato and Pyrrho had been painters, and eight of the namesakes were painters.[43] Besides Socrates and Pythagoras, six of the namesakes were musical, and Timon was for a time a stage-dancer.[44] The-

[37] II 114 I 94, 122 III 23 II 7 III 23 II 7, 98 VI 72 IX 3, 6, etc.

[38] I 45, 63, 79 VIII 86 IX 23.

[39] III 8 I 101 II 104, 125, 104 IV 15 X 26, etc.

[40] I 84 II 20, 65 IV 18 V 3 VIII 58 IX 25, 51 X 24 II 62, 63 V 80 VIII 58 IX 114, 110.

[41] I 38 II 3, 15 VIII 47 II 17, 64, 120 IV 58 V 83 II 104 V 35 IX 49.

[42] II 19, 15, 59, 64, 124, etc.

[43] III 5 IX 61, 62 I 38 II 104 V 83 VI 101.

[44] II 32 VIII 12 II 104 VII 164 VIII 82 IX 17, 49, 109.

ologians and diviners were represented chiefly among the barbarians, the sages, and the more ancient philosophers such as Musaeus, Linus, Pythagoras, and Empedocles, although the Stoics too were interested in theology, and Menedemus and Antisthenes participated in the mysteries.[45]

Several of the philosophers as well as ten of the namesakes were physicians, and Plato experienced the truth of the words of Homer that "beyond all men the Egyptians were physicians."[46] Besides Plato and Eudoxus, a number of the earlier philosophers and two namesakes applied themselves to astronomy, including Thales, who fell into a ditch while gazing at the stars with his maidservant.[47] Among the philosophers there were also mathematicians and such as studied geometry.[48]

In addition Diogenes tells us of a shepherd, a sausage maker's son, a builder, a miner, a fuller, a banker, a pugilist, a long distance runner, an athletic trainer, a boxer, and an architect.[49] For seventeen of the minor philosophers no occupations are given.

Wealth and poverty. — Thales, who gained a corner on olives, and Plato, who was able to buy the Pythagorean books from Philolaus, are examples of a half dozen philosophers who are said to have been wealthy and to whom are added by Diogenes a namesake of Demetrius and the second wife of Menedemus.[50] Some of the philosophers, however, were pinched by poverty and were even sold into slavery, though they showed their feeling of superiority

[45] I 2, 5, 6, 43, 88, 110, 116, 119, 3, 4 VIII 3, 20, 53, 59 VII 119 II 131 VI 4.

[46] VIII 12, 58, 83, 86 IX 116 II 59, 104 IV 5 V 1, 61, 94 VII 35, 186, 186 VIII 61 III 7.

[47] I 6, 11, 23, 34, 39, 119 II 4, 5, 10 III 29 VIII 86 IX 33, 56.

[48] I 11, 24 II 103 IV 32, 53, 60 VIII 11, 12, 48, 83, 86.

[49] I 109 II 60, 125 IV 23 V 36 VI 82 VII 186, 179 VIII 46, 48, 82.

[50] I 26, 75 II 137 III 9 IV 38 V 84, 86 VIII 66, 73.

toward the wealthy partly by acting independently toward them, and partly by not hesitating to associate with them.[51] Also in a number of sayings philosophers expressed their contempt for mere wealth. Thus Aristippus explained the reason why philosophers go to rich men's houses and not vice versa as because the former know what they need and the latter do not, or because physicians attend on the sick and not the sick on physicians. Bion exceptionally called wealth the sinews of success.[52]

The mention of the debates between the Cyrenaics and the school of Hegesias about the relations of riches to pleasure, of the admission of wealth as external goods by Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, and of the contempt for wealth expressed in the teachings of the Cyrenaics is indicative of the prominence belonging, in the mind of Diogenes, to the theme on which he cites an essay written by Onetor, "Whether a wise man will make money." [53] At any rate, Diogenes' philosophers appear to have remained unspoiled by their poverty or riches.

Travels. — Some of the philosophers are portrayed as great travelers, especially Xenophon, Plato, Bion, Aristotle, Pythagoras, Eudoxus, and Democritus. Even the journey of Epicharmus of Cos as an infant of three months to Megara and to Syracuse is reported from his own writings. But Socrates, "unlike most philosophers of his day, had no need to travel," and Thales commended Pherecydes for applying himself to writing "while we who never write anything travel all over Hellas and Asia." [54]

The fear of tyrants prompted Solon, the disciples of

[51] II 62 III 36 IV 59 IX 21, 39 IV 14 VI 74 IX 20 VII 22, 30, 171 VI 96 IX 21.

[52] I 59, 86 II 31, 69, 70 VI 74, 95.

[53] II 92, 94 III 78 V 30 VI 104 VII 107 III 9.

[54] II 49 III 5 IV 53 V 1 VIII 2, 86 IX 35 VIII 78 II 22 I 44.

Socrates, and Pythagoras to seek safety at other places, and Menedemus, Plato, and Lysis of Tarentum had to take flight when they were under suspicion of taking part in plots.[55] Not a few were condemned to exile.[56] Military expeditions and political embassies took others away from home.[57] Solon, who conversed with Croesus, opened the line of philosophers who traveled to the courts of kings.[58] Several journeys were motivated by considerations of business or financial need and by the desire for sightseeing. Pythagoras went to Delos to bury Pherecydes, and Epicurus was so fond of Athens that he traveled but once or twice to visit friends. Pleasure and extravagance were unworthy motives for travel.[59] But while philosophers by unnecessary traveling caused cities to be abandoned by the best of men, much of their traveling was done for the purpose of studying and teaching philosophy.[60] Athens was the centre of attraction for the students and teachers of philosophy,[61] though the places which the philosophers honored by their presence were as far removed as Egypt, Asia, Persia, India, and Ethiopia.[62]

Little is said by Diogenes, however, concerning the places visited. More emphasis is laid on the varied experiences of the philosophers during their travels. Some enjoyed the companionship of pupils or friends, as Euripides is said

[55] I 50, 113 II 106 VIII 3 II 40 III 21 VIII 7.

[56] I 22 II 43, 63, 103, 116, 140 III 3 V 38 VI 20, 22, 38, 49 VIII 52, 67 IX 18, 51.

[57] II 23, 51, 58, 125 III 8 II 102, 140 V 2.

[58] I 50, 67 II 61, 79, 115, 129 III 23 V 1, 2 VII 177.

[59] VII 2, 32 II 61 VIII 86 IX 109 I 44 III 18 VIII 40 X 10 IV 1, 53.

[60] II 125 VIII 7, 2, 3 III 5.

[61] II 65 IV 29, 67 VI 21 VII 28, 32 VIII 86 II 65 III 5 V 1, 36 VIII 87.

[62] I 50, 44 IX 35, 61, 35, etc.

to have accompanied Plato to Egypt.[63] Others faced great perils, were taken prisoners, suffered shipwreck, or died while traveling.[64] But whatever the facts about the traveling of the ancients, it had permanent ethical value in the opportunities it afforded for the exercise of hospitality and other social virtues.[65]

Relations to tyrants. — Some thirty tyrants play a part in the lives of Diogenes' philosophers. Tyrants came to live with philosophers, but more frequently philosophers went to live with tyrants or to visit them at their courts.[66] Tyrants frequently patronized philosophers by giving them large sums of money, the exact amounts of which are often noted by Diogenes, or by giving them other presents.[67] Again, the tyrants would grant the requests of philosophers or honor them for their excellence, thus causing the philosophers at times to be jealous of each other.[68] The philosophers in turn instructed the tyrants or their sons and entertained them with discussions of philosophical themes, such as the discourse on the duty of doing good to men, by which Stilpo impressed Demetrius so forcibly that Demetrius became eager to hear him.[69] A common way of winning the favor of tyrants or showing gratitude to them was by dedicating books to them.[70]

The philosophers, however, were plainly superior to the tyrants and showed their superiority to them on occasion by

[63] I 22 II 22 III 6 IV 6, 23, 29 IX 58, 61.

[64] I 113 II 71, 79 III 18 VII 2, 5 IX 55, 56.

[65] I 67, 102 II 79, 136 III 8, etc.

[66] VI 88 I 27 V 1 II 61, 102 III 18 V 3, 9 VII 6, 177, 185 VIII 87.

[67] II 61 III 9 IV 38, 42 V 58 VII 169 II 81, 67 IV 54.

[68] IV 8 V 3 VIII 85 II 65 III 40 IV 8 V 68 VII 6, 15 II 61 III 36 V 9.

[69] II 110, 140 III 34 V 3, 58 VII 136, 170 II 116, 67, 111, 129 VII 177 IX 60.

[70] II 84, 110 IV 14, 38 IX 109.

declining their invitations, returning their gifts, neglecting to dedicate books to them, making bold utterances in their presence, etc.[71] Well might tyrants therefore wish they had become philosophers! But philosophers did not express the wish that they had become tyrants. On the contrary, philosophers uttered disparaging sayings concerning the tyrants.[72]

The lot of the tyrants was after all unenviable, and worse than their lot was their moral degradation. Diogenes graphically describes their cruelties and shows them in their angry moods.[73] Worst of all was their treatment of the philosophers, who had to fear them and flee from them and whom they imprisoned or punished unmercifully, so that those philosophers who delivered their cities from tyrants were worthy of the highest esteem.[74] On the other hand, the laws of the sages and of the philosophers were good, their embassies and other public services were distinguished, and the rule of Pythagoras and his followers in Croton was a true aristocracy or government by the best.[75]

Trials. — The honor of the philosophers was not diminished, but rather enhanced, by their conduct in trials. When by way of exception they acted as pleaders they did so effectively and courageously.[76] But their usual rôle was that of defendants. The charges brought against them were of a political or religious nature.[77] But whatever the charges, they were generally false.[78] Diogenes furnished

[71] II 25 IV 8, 38 II 67, etc.
[72] VI 32 IX 13 I 36, 59 VI 29, 58 IX 20, 63.
[73] I 36, 94 II 67 VII 5 III 8 IV 11 V 9.
[74] II 129, 79 VII 186 II 143 V 89 VIII 64, 72 IX 28, etc.
[75] II 140 IV 8, 39 V 2 VIII 2.
[76] I 84 III 24.
[77] II 13 III 19 V 79 IX 27 II 12, 40 V 37 IX 51 II 101, 116 V 6.
[78] IV 17 VII 168 II 35, 37, 142 IX 115.

details concerning the prosecution, defense, modes of escape, and condemnation of the accused, the only formal acquittals reported being that of Anaxagoras (according to one account) because of his physical condition and that of Plato on the island of Aegina because of the contempt of the inhabitants for philosophers.[79] As an after-effect of the trials, however, additional lustre was shed on the name of the philosophers, and such as had taken part in the persecution met with disaster.[80]

Old age. — While a tyrant growing old was the strangest thing Thales declared he had ever seen (I 36), the great philosophers, according to Diogenes and his authorities, lived to a venerable old age, having been privileged to make full proof of their abilities and excellences (X 25). Ten philosophers are said, in a general way, to have died in old age, and for thirty-four definite ages are given ranging from 53 to 109 and varying in ten cases according to different accounts. The average of the ages recorded, including the alternate accounts, is 81.[81] Athletes, when they grow old, are " worn threadbare," but the physical, mental, and moral powers of the aged philosophers were unimpaired (except that Theophrastus had to be carried about in a litter).[82] According to the sayings of various philosophers old age is to be honored, provision is to be made against it by such means as education, philosophy, and magic, and it is to be borne with good humor.[83] Diogenes and other versifiers,

[79] III 39, 40 V 6, 37 IX 54 II 116, 142 III 41 II 101 V 79 IX 57 II 12, 13, 41, 42, 101 V 77 IX 27 II 14 III 19.

[80] III 20 II 43 V 37 II 43.

[81] Or 89, if the figures for Epimenides are included (I 111). The greatest variations are in the accounts of Empedocles (VIII 52, 73).

[82] I 56 II 132, 32 VI 34 I 71 V 41.

[83] I 71 IV 51 V 21 X 122 I 88, 105 IV 50 VI 78, 34, 92 VII 171, 174 IV 48.

moreover, speak with becoming reverence of old age, in suitable epigrams.[84]

Death and burial. — The death of the philosophers was a fitting climax to their experiences. Diogenes was much impressed by the fact of death. Antisthenes had said, "The height of human bliss is to die happy." The greatest of all evils was the fear of death. This fear was to be overcome by a proper theory of good and evil and by such considerations as the naturalness of death, our insensibility in death, and the indifference of life and death. The Gymnosophists even despised death, but the ignorance of what would happen after death ought to deter men from wickedness — as had been clearly taught in the myths of Plato.[85]

The ideal way of dying was exemplified by the philosophers of old. Hence Aristippus could, to the question how Socrates died, reply, "As I would wish to die myself," and Diogenes Laertius could sing of the death of Chilon, "May such a death be mine."[86] By noting carefully time, place, circumstances, and causes of death, the last requests of the dying relative to their burial and the remembrance of their doctrines,[87] and the funeral processions accorded the dead, Diogenes invested his accounts with verisimilitude.

Generally it was considered preferable to die in one's native land, but Anaxagoras said, "The descent to Hades is much the same from whatever place we start."[88] The circumstances under which the philosophers died were varied, Thales meeting his end at an athletic contest and Plato at a wedding feast, Anacharsis while hunting or with his ex-

[84] I 85 II 120 VI 78 VII 31 IX 65.

[85] VI 5 X 125 II 92, 54 IV 26 IX 27 IV 49 VI 67 X 81, 124, 139 I 35 II 94 VI 4 X 126 I 6 III 80 VI 5.

[86] II 76, 47, 35 I 73.

[87] I 62, 118 IV 25 VI 79 V 41 X 16 II 14.

[88] IV 25 II 56, 11. The place of death is given for at least eighteen of the philosophers.

hortations still uncompleted in his mouth, etc.[89] The causes of death reported by Diogenes include drink, old age, accidents, murder, and formal executions. But Diogenes loved to dwell most on the diseases of the philosophers, especially if these diseases involved gradual decay.[90] Many of the philosophers committed suicide by starving themselves or by other methods, because of incurable maladies, the inability to solve their problems, or for other reasons, for suicide in the face of unbearable ills was considered a courageous act.[91] The wrath of heaven was visited on Heraclides, who had forged an oracle for his own glorification, and on Pollis, who had offered Plato for sale in Aegina.[92]

The eminent philosophers received magnificent funerals and honorable burials. Plato was even honored at his death by Philip.[93] But after death the philosophers were not forgotten. They belonged to the immortals, and their praise was recorded in suitable epitaphs composed by many authors, including Diogenes Laertius himself.

Epigrams. — Diogenes quotes forty-nine of his own epigrams for forty-three different philosophers and thirty-one epigrams and inscriptions composed by other authors on twenty-three philosophers, the philosophers represented in both groups numbering fourteen. In addition there were sixteen epigrams which had supposedly been composed by five of the philosophers themselves, Plato alone being responsible for eleven of these. Many of the inscriptions are alleged to have been taken from the statues and tombs of those whom they were intended to celebrate.[94] Diogenes

[89] I 38, 102 III 2, 18 VIII 40, 41, 68 X 15, etc. See also IV 64!
[90] IV 45 I 38 II 110 I 102 II 12 IV 3 I 118, etc.
[91] II 142 IV 3 II 112, 12 IV 3, etc.
[92] V 91 III 20.
[93] V 41 II 14 III 40, etc.
[94] I 34, 85, 79, 97 VII 12, etc.

Laertius manifested an antiquarian interest in statues, tombs, and temples [95] and in the sayings and teachings that had clustered around the subject of statues and tombs.[96] Freudenthal has pointed out that Diogenes quotes as his own product an epigram (III 45) which had already been known to Olympiodorus and to Plutarch.[97]

Diogenes had incorporated the information given by him concerning the time, place, circumstances, and causes of the death of his philosophers both in his necrological accounts proper and in his epitaphs. It has even been suggested by one Patrizzi (quoted by Nietzsche) that Diogenes wrote his history, " ut haberet quo loco elegantia illa sua vel Epigrammata vel Epitaphia insereret." [98] Freudenthal, however, declared that only a mentally unbalanced person would write an epitome of ten books to preserve a few poetic verses and called attention to the sixty-three sections following the epigram of Diogenes Laertius on Plato, the twenty-six sections following the epigram on Aristotle, the seventeen sections following the epigram on Theophrastus, and the many biographies devoid of the Laertian poetry.[99]

In his Πάμμετρος Diogenes had trifled with metres of various kinds.[100] On the basis of Diogenes' reference: ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἐπιγραμμάτων ἢ Παμμέτρῳ (I 39), Nietzsche supposed that the title Πάμμετρος applied to but one of several books in a larger work which may well have included epigrams by other authors, Diogenes having used for his own epigrams the same sources on which his historical

[95] II 19 I 48 V 57, etc. Cf. VIII 72, 73 V 15, 51, 71.

[96] II 33, 116 VI 23, 35, 49, 50, 60, 69 VII 57 II 10.

[97] Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien,* III, 304.

[98] Nietzsche, *Werke,* XVII, 175, 176, quoting Francesco Patrizzi, *discuss. Peripat.,* I, 3, p. 19.

[99] Freudenthal, *op. cit.,* 314.

[100] For the names he gives to the metres, see I 63 VII 31 VIII 75 IX 43 I 120 IV 65 VI 79 VII 164.

compilation, according to Nietzsche, was based, namely Diocles and Favorinus.[101] Von Gutschmid was grateful that the work containing Diogenes' collection of epigrams has perished. "Gratias Apollini et Musis agamus, quod ἡ Πάμμετρος illa Diogenis, cuius ipse saepius mentionem iniecit, aetatem non tulit. Pauci enim hi versus abunde nauseam movent, Tzetzis ingenio dignissimi."[102] Cobet, on the other hand, in commenting on the epigrams, declared: "Omnis Diogenis Laertii Musa salsa et venusta est."[103]

In his verses Diogenes often employed picturesque terms for death. Zeus snatched Thales from the stadium, a winged swift arrow took Anacharsis to the immortals, Bias stretched himself in a long sleep, etc.[104] Diogenes is fond, moreover, of contrasting the condition of the body which has been left behind with that of the soul which has soared above. He delights in depicting the state of the immortalized by comparing or contrasting it with some characteristic state in life. Thus he exhorts: "Drink, then, being in Zeus's palace, O Socrates;" and he thanks Zeus, the sun god, for removing Thales so near to him since the aged man could no longer "discern the stars from the earth."[105] In a humorous vein Diogenes also makes puns on names, as when "Cronos" is said to have deserved his name better if C and R were gone; and he satirizes the teachings of the Pythagoreans.[106]

Furthermore, Diogenes in his epigrams praises the eminent philosophers for their wisdom and excellences and records the achievements by which they gained their immortality, such as the lawgiving of Solon.[107] On the other

[101] Nietzsche, *op. cit.*, 172–76.

[102] Von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften,* I, 188, note 1.

[103] Cobet, *Collectanea Critica,* 459.

[104] I 35, 63, 85, 103 II 58, 112, 120 IV 56, 61 VI 19 VII 31, 176 X 16.

[105] I 63 IV 20 IX 28, 59 I 39 II 46 III 45 IV 27 V 68 VII 164, 176 IX 4, 56 X 16. [106] II 112 IV 61 VI 19, 100 VIII 44, 45.

[107] II 46, 58, 15 V 79 IX 43 III 45 I 63 II 58 IX 28.

hand, he does not hesitate to chide the philosophers for their atheism, deceitful and pretentious claims, fear of death, and suicide.[108] Finally he drew moral lessons from their death, such as contentment in disappointments, perseverance in toil, and the folly of unexecuted intentions.[109] Also the epigrammatists quoted by Diogenes praised the philosophers for their wisdom, their character, their achievements, their birth and ancestry, their occupations, their wealth, their cities, and their manner of dying.[110]

Namesakes. — Many of his biographies Diogenes Laertius concluded with a list of homonyms. Such lists are given for forty-eight of the philosophers, who are thus to be distinguished from their namesakes. Twenty namesakes each have been listed for Demetrius and Theodorus, fourteen for Heraclides, etc. There are chapters on two men named Zeno and on two named Crates, whose namesakes are given, and on two men named Menedemus and on two named Diogenes, for whom there is no list of namesakes. The information recorded concerning the namesakes includes the schools to which they belonged, their teachers, achievements, fame, birth, occupations, nicknames, relations to tyrants, writings, style, etc.[111]

Diogenes Laertius as Biographer

Fundamental strains. — The biographies of Diogenes Laertius are thus seen to be compilations of materials collected according to a formal scheme. The large number of anecdotes contained in them are characterized by a straining after the sensational, bizarre, and unusual. Much stress

[108] IV 55 V 90 VIII 75 IV 65 II 15 IV 3, 65 V 8 VI 100.

[109] I 97 V 40 VIII 84.

[110] I 34 III 43, 30 IV 31 I 62, 97, 4, 5, etc.

[111] II 64 III 109 VII 35 VIII 47 II 104 I 98 II 3, 64 I 98 II 47 IV 45, etc.

is laid by the author on the social features of the lives of the philosophers. Throughout the stories of their careers there appears to be a dominant and all-pervading moral interest. Concrete references to times, places, and circumstances give to the whole the semblance of credibility. The telling of the experiences and achievements of the Greek philosophers serves the purpose of their glorification.

The ideal life. — The philosophic life was, moreover, viewed by Diogenes Laertius as exemplary. From beginning to end all that a Greek of the Hellenistic world might desire in life and in death was achieved by the philosophers of old. They had distinguished themselves, or distinction had been conferred upon them, by their birth and descent, their native and other dwelling places, their personal names, their physical, mental, moral, and social characteristics, their conduct in marriage, their sex-life and social life, their friendships and enmities, their vocational activities or their rise from inferior occupations, their wealth and poverty, their travels, their relations to tyrants, their trials, their old age, their death, the epigrams and epitaphs that had been written upon them, and the namesakes from whom they were to be distinguished. The *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius are therefore to be regarded not as authentic biographies aiming at historical truth, but as eulogistic narratives reflecting the conceptions of the author concerning the ideal life and intended to please the tastes of his readers.

Chapter V

HIS ACCOUNTS OF PHILOSOPHIC OPINIONS

The Sayings of the Philosophers

The relation of biography to doxography. — The philosophical benefactors of the world and embodiments of the good life who are depicted for us by Diogenes Laertius measured up to every test of greatness in life and in death because of the opinions they held and passed on to posterity and despite the variety of their teachings. Biography and doxography were allied in the mind of Diogenes not in this way that the opinions of the philosophers reflected their experiences, but rather that the teachings they received and communicated were usually productive of the kind of life they lived. The formal doctrines enunciated by the philosophers are, however, treated separately and out of every vital relationship with the course of their life, except in the passage where it is said of Plato: " It may have been out of his own experience that he declared a wise man will legislate for his country unless the corrupt state of affairs justifies his abstention " (III 78). Only the brief sayings for which the philosophers had become famous are recorded as integral parts of the biographical accounts, and then chiefly as memorials of the fame of those who had uttered these sayings.

Topics of sayings. — The sayings of Diogenes' philosophers run the gamut of the interests reflected in his book. There is the high regard for philosophy as providing a " way of life." [1] The saying attributed to Diogenes that " educa-

[1] II 68, 78 V 31 VI 24, 65, 103, 104 VII 2, 26, 87, 89, 130, 161, 165 VIII 13 X 87, 104.

tion is a grace to the young, a consolation to the old, wealth to the poor, and an ornament to the rich," is representative of the utterances on education.[2] Philosophy is contrasted with ordinary concerns, with poetry, and with rhetoric.[3] Some disparaging comments are also made on schools, teachers, and pupils.[4]

The sayings of Theophrastus in his last message are representative of sayings dealing with life and death and with an evaluation of life. The *dictum* of Bias that "life is to be measured as if we had both a short and a long time to live," is one of a number of precepts concerning life in general.[5] There are multitudinous sayings on the various stages and fortunes of human life which may be grouped according to many of the rubrics according to which Diogenes had arranged his biographical materials.[6]

The sayings about philosophic doctrines emphasize the relation between doctrine and life.[7] Most of the ethical sayings and stories refer to pride, especially the pride of Plato, there being several on virtue in general and one on the difference between prudence and courage.[8] Solon's comparison of laws with spiders' webs is the first of several sayings recorded about laws, and Diogenes' comparison of demagogues with lackeys may be quoted from the several political sayings.[9] In other sayings we have definitions of beauty, Plato's definition of man as a featherless biped, etc., and the relation between facts and arguments is at the basis

[2] VI 68 V 18, 20 VII 22 II 31, 32, 71 IX 1, 58.
[3] VII 182 I 59 VI 47 IV 49, etc.
[4] VII 19, 173 IV 32, 62 V 2, etc.
[5] V 41 I 87, etc.
[6] I 37 II 33 VII 23 II 36, 114 I 86 VI 47 II 67 VI 68 I 58 VI 3 IV 48 I 63, etc.
[7] VIII 39 IX 64.
[8] VI 7, 26, 41 II 32 I 78, etc.
[9] I 58, 71 V 17 X 2 VI 4, 5, 63 IX 3 V 82.

of a number of stories and sayings, including the story of Diogenes from which originated the phrase *solvitur ambulando*.[10] None of the sayings are indicative of an interest in natural phenomena, unless it be one of Pittacus on growing strong as a work of nature or the question addressed by Diogenes to one discoursing on celestial phenomena: "How long were you in coming from the sky?"[11] The lack of interest in an understanding of nature is evidenced also in the disproportionate amount of space devoted to the sayings of the sages in Book I as opposed to the little attention devoted to the cosmological inquiries of the early Ionian philosophers.

The Cynic Diogenes, who was always looking for "men," in a number of sayings berated the follies of men.[12] Such human foibles belonged to the θαυμαστά Diogenes Laertius was so fond of writing about: the judging of contests by non-experts, the counting of one's sheep but not of one's friends, the investigation of the ills of Odysseus instead of one's own, etc.[13] The Skeptics reckoned the θαυμαζόμενα among the things which gained credence, and the Stoics taught that the wise man does not "wonder" even at seeming paradoxes, Epicurus putting those who laid down any single explanation of natural phenomena as assured on a level with those who seek to dazzle the multitude with "marvels."[14]

Types of sayings. — More than 120 sayings of the philosophers took the form of answers to questions. Many of these have to do with the application of adjectives to things, as when Thales was asked what is difficult, easy, pleasant,

[10] V 18, 19 VII 23 VI 40 I 108 VII 20 VI 39.
[11] I 86 VI 39.
[12] VI 24, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 41, 47, 58, 60.
[13] I 103, 104 II 30, 33 VI 28, 30, 48, 59 IX 3, 27.
[14] IX 78 VII 123 IX 87, 114 X 114.

strange, etc., or when to the question: "What is both good and bad?" Anacharsis replied, "The tongue."[15] Others show the gains to be derived from philosophy or the advantages of the educated over the uneducated.[16] There are questions dealing with the meaning of philosophy, the schools of philosophy, the writings of philosophers and poets, the kind of life to lead, the multifarious concerns of life, etc.[17] Some of the questions turned about definitions, or they were trick questions such as the famous question, "Have you left off beating your father?"[18] Arguments in the form of questions and answers are said to be characteristic of dialectic, and Homer was a Skeptic because to the same question he more than any one else gave different answers at different times.[19] A few questions may be said to belong to religion and to politics. But the closest approach to a question pertaining to nature is the one asked of Anaxagoras, if the hills of Lampsacus would ever become the sea, to which he replied, "Yes, it only needs time!"[20]

Among the various types of sententious sayings uttered by Diogenes' philosophers were the so-called "apothegms." Seven apothegms are attributed to Thales (e.g., γνῶθι σαυτόν), and one to each of six other sages. Socrates continually recited apothegms in iambics, the sayings attributed to Aristotle are given under the title of apothegms, and apothegms of Theophrastus were in circulation.[21]

Several philosophers furnished occasion for the origin of proverbs, an example being the reference of the Pythagoreans to their master in the words Αὐτὸς ἔφα.[22]

[15] I 35, 103 V 20 VI 5, 51, 69, etc.

[16] II 68 V 20 VI 3, 63, 86 — I 69 II 68 IV 60 V 19, 20 VI 7 VII 172, 183 VIII 16. [17] VIII 8 VI 3 II 22 IX 113 I 36 II 129, etc.

[18] I 86 V 18 VI 67 II 135 VII 172.

[19] II 106 III 48 IV 28, etc. IX 71. [20] I 36, 86, 59, 77 II 7, 10.

[21] I 6, 35, 39, 63, 72, 79, 88, 93, 99 II 25 V 17–21, 34, 40.

[22] I 101 VII 27 VIII 46 III 40, 47.

Manifold was the "advice" given by the philosophers, including advice on the subject of advice itself.[23] Philosophers were expected to give advice in civic, political, military, social, marital, educational, and practical affairs, including the construction of buildings, as well as advice to "men in general."[24] Occasionally philosophers themselves were in need of advice, like Socrates in prison.[25] Some sixty sayings of philosophers are quoted in the form of precepts, most of them by the sages, others by Arcesilaus, Pythagoras, Epicurus, and the Magi. They have to do with the training of the memory, the avoidance of gesticulation, the choice of companions, etc.[26]

More interesting are the repartees, puns, and witticisms of the philosophers. There are a score of repartees, a number of which are included in the account of Diogenes the Cynic, who is expressly declared to have been "ready at repartee" (VI 74). Thus when Alexander said, "I am Alexander the great king," he replied, "I am Diogenes the hound."[27] Among the plays on words are the saying of Diogenes, "It is better to be a Megarian's ram (κριόν) than his son (υἱόν)," and the direction of Antisthenes bidding a lad "come with a new book, a new pen, and new tablets" (καινοῦ), implying the need of a mind too (καὶ νοῦ).[28] Then there are a number of witticisms as by Stilpo, who ran away from Crates to buy a fish, saying, "The argument will remain, but the fish will soon be sold"; and by Diogenes, who sat down by the target of a bad archer "not to get hit."[29] Some of the stories are of a less palatable variety,

[23] I 60 III 98, 106 V 66.

[24] V 66 I 25, 116 VI 8 II 50 I 79 V 41 II 103 I 60, 88, 92 VIII 22, etc.

[25] II 60 VI 55. [26] IX 71 I 60 IV 40 VIII 17 X 139 I 7, etc.

[27] VI 60, 61 IX 20, etc.

[28] VI 3, 41 II 18, 81, 118, etc.

[29] II 119 VI 67, 38, 47 IV 37.

as that of Dionysius spitting on Aristippus or Aristippus on the steward of Dionysius.[30] Pythagoras is said to have avoided "insulting jests and vulgar tales," at which Bion was "great." [31]

About seventy times the philosophers quoted or paraphrased the poets, especially Homer and Euripides, to give expression to their thoughts. Thus Plato, after listening to Socrates, consigned his poems to the flames, saying: "Come hither, Hephaestus, Plato now hath need of thee"; just as Metrocles later set fire to his notes of the lectures of Theophrastus, saying, "Come hither, Hephaestus, Thetis now hath need of thee." [32]

The collection of sayings made by him, extensive as it is, Diogenes would have us understand, is not as complete as he was able to make it. Especially for Aristotle and for Diogenes there were more sayings, which "it would be tedious to enumerate." [33]

Formal Philosophic Doctrines

The fixation of the doctrines. — The formal doctrines of the philosophers Diogenes introduced by the use of such terms as *ἀρέσκει*, *δοκεῖ*, *βούλεται*, etc.[34] Formal philosophic doctrines are fixed, especially when they have been perpetuated in the writings of the philosophers or in the expositions of others.[35] Even the doctrines of the Skeptics were presented by Diogenes in the same formal manner as the doctrines of other schools.[36] Fixed doctrines were be-

[30] II 67 VI 75 II 81, etc.
[31] VIII 20 IV 51.
[32] III 5 VI 95. See also IV 26 VII 26, 28, etc.
[33] V 34 VI 69.
[34] II 2 VI 60 VII 156 IX 11 V 28, etc.
[35] V 41 X 12, 35, 57, 82 II 136 IV 32 X 37 IX 22.
[36] I 16 IX 74, 68, 62, 79, 88.

lieved to possess great charm or were praised as having proceeded from a divine source.[37] Doctrines were often sufficiently characterized by a mere reference to the teachers or schools who held them, as when Plato is said to have "mixed together doctrines of Heraclitus, the Pythagoreans, and Socrates."[38] The ascription of teachings "common" to philosophic schools and even to groups of schools is exemplified in a striking manner in the chapter on the Stoics and in the account of the controversy between the Skeptics and the dogmatists.[39]

Brief and detailed accounts. — The author's favorite method of exposition was to state the doctrines first by way of summary (στοιχειωδῶς, κεφαλαιωδῶς, ἐπὶ κεφαλαίων, καθολικῶς) and then in detail (κατὰ μέρους, κατ' εἶδος).[40] This method was considered appropriate for an introductory handbook and, according to Diogenes Laertius, was followed by Anaximander, Diogenes, and Epicurus.[41]

The divisions of philosophy. — Philosophic doctrine is threefold, philosophy being divided into physics, ethics, and dialectic. This division of philosophy was "first" made by Zeno and the Stoics and was followed by the Epicureans, though Diogenes Laertius applied it also to the early history of philosophy. Aristotle's division of philosophy into theoretical, including physics and logic, and practical, including ethics and politics, is but a variation of this threefold division of philosophy.[42] The division adopted by Diogenes

[37] X 9 VIII 21.

[38] III 8 IV 51 VIII 51, etc.

[39] VII 38, 160 IX 102–106. See also IV 47 VI 19.

[40] III 47 VII 38, 48, 131, 160 IX 7, 8, 30 X 34 I 40. See Gercke, "Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik," in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Litteratur,* VII (1901), 17.

[41] VII 48, 160 II 2 VI 31 X 35, 135, 68, 82, 83, 84, 85.

[42] I 18 VII 39 X 29 I 16, 18 II 16 III 56 V 28.

Laertius runs through his book and is the basis of the brief summary of the teachings of the Eclectic Potamo; the characterization of Plato's philosophy as Heraclitean with regard to sensible things, Pythagorean with regard to intelligible things, and Socratic with regard to political things; the classification of Plato's dialogues; the historical account of the divisions of philosophy as illustrated and elaborated by the Stoics; the treatment of the doctrines of the Epicureans; etc.[43] Each of the three branches of philosophy is defined, and their relations to each other are indicated according to the conceptions of the various schools.[44] In the accounts of philosophic opinion given by Diogenes Laertius, theological and scientific views come to be treated with physics, political views with ethics, and explanations of words, and definitions and divisions with dialectic. Such treatment was partly in harmony with the Stoic elaboration of the threefold division of philosophy. The doctrinal notes collected by Diogenes Laertius in accordance with this scheme are indicative of his main interests in the philosophies of the ancients as well as of the typical problems which were of concern to his readers.

Physics

The praise of physics. — The most ancient and important branch of philosophy, according to Diogenes Laertius, was physics. It was concerned with the universe and all that the universe contains. Its primary value was ethical. According to Epicurus, its aim was to drive away the fear of celestial phenomena and of death and to give happiness. It was considered useless by Socrates, Aristippus, and the Cynics, whose interests were ethical. It was distinguished from

[43] I 21 III 8, 50 VII 39–41 X 30.
[44] I 18 VII 83.

myth, according to Epicurus, by being free from the limitation to one among several possible explanations.[45]

The eminent physicists. — The first to discourse on physics was Thales. Homer's physical doctrine was first studied by Metrodorus of Lampsacus. Archelaus was called the physicist because with him physics came to an end, although Socrates, with whom ethics started, also discoursed on physics inasmuch as he discussed providence. Others expressly singled out as "physicists" were Phrasidemus (the pupil of Stilpo), Strato, a namesake of Diogenes, and Diogenes of Apollonia. Aristotle excelled in the investigation of causes, explaining in his numerous notebooks even the most insignificant phenomena. Noted physicists were also Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Epicurus, and Alcmaeon, who gave utterance to the saying: "Most human affairs go in pairs." Carneades, however, was stronger in ethics than in physics.[46]

The first physical treatise was composed by Alcmaeon, the first with the title *περὶ φύσεως* by Philolaus, and among other physical treatises were Plato's *Timaeus* and Aristotle's notebooks, the work of Heraclitus being a treatise on government.[47] The study of physics was facilitated by the division of physics into its proper *τόποι* as made by the Stoics and Epicureans[48] as well as by Diogenes Laertius himself in his accounts of the physical opinions of the philosophers. Such accounts are given for comparatively few of Diogenes' philosophers; namely, for Potamo and Thales in Book I; for Anaximander, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, and Socrates in Book II; for Plato in Book III; for

[45] V 64 I 18 X 142, 78 II 21, 92 VI 103 X 87.

[46] I 23, 24, 116 II 11, 16 I 18 II 45 — II 114 V 58, 61, 64 VI 81 IX 57 — V 32 VIII 56, 83 IX 37 X 32 IV 62.

[47] III 50 V 32 VIII 83, 85 IX 15.

[48] VII 132 X 37.

Aristotle and Strato, both in a few references only, in Book V; for the Stoics in Book VII; for Pythagoras and Empedocles in addition to a few references to Alcmaeon, Hippasus, and Philolaus in Book VIII; for Heraclitus, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Leucippus, Democritus, and the Skeptics in addition to a few references to Melissus, Zeno of Elea, Protagoras, and Diogenes of Apollonia in Book IX; and for Epicurus in Book X.

Physical doctrines. — Diogenes Laertius was greatly interested in the teachings of the various philosophers about the universe as a whole. The doctrine of Anaxagoras concerning an original chaos he finds anticipated in the cosmogony of Linus, and he relates the origin of the world as it was conceived by the Stoics, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Zeno of Elea, Leucippus, Democritus, Diogenes of Apollonia, and Epicurus.[49] The nature of the universe is described, such adjectives as animate, intelligent, etc., being ascribed to it, and opposing views being given as to whether it is limited or unlimited, one or many.[50]

Also particular phenomena were of interest to Diogenes Laertius as calling for explanation. The wise man never " wonders " at extraordinary phenomena according to the Stoics, while according to Epicurus the purpose of natural explanation was to remove fear. Aristotle was known for having explained even the most insignificant phenomena, and already the Egyptians gave " physical explanations " of phenomena.[51] Among the general principles recorded by Diogenes were the Epicurean canon to seek peace of mind and follow the prompting of the facts, and the principle of Democritus and of Diogenes of Apollonia that nothing can

[49] II 6 I 4 VII 142 VIII 25 IX 7, 21, 29, 30, 31, 45, 57 X 73.

[50] I 27 III 74 VII 143 VIII 25 VII 140 VIII 84 II 17 IX 24, 31 III 71 VII 140, 143 IX 24 IX 19, 29, 31, 44, 57 X 89.

[51] III 109 VII 123 X 143 V 32 I 11.

come into being from what is not or pass away into what is not.[52] Among the phenomena explained were: the production of sound, human vision, the mixture of substances, the immutability of earth, the seasons, clouds, thunderstorms, etc. Plato, e.g., assumed as the cause why earth is not subject to change, "the peculiarity of its constituent triangles."[53]

One of the favorite categories under which Diogenes Laertius grouped the comments that belonged to physics was that of the "elements." The term στοιχεῖον was one of those which Plato was the first to use in philosophy and differed from ἀρχή according to the Stoics in that the "principles" designated by the latter term were without generation or destruction, incorporeal, and destitute of form. The two "principles" were the good and evil spirit according to the Magi, God and matter according to Plato, and an active and a passive principle according to the Stoics. Musaeus derived all things from the one, Pythagoras from the monad, etc.[54] The "elements" were four according to Plato, the Stoics, Empedocles, and Xenophanes, two according to Parmenides, five according to Aristotle, and one according to Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Diogenes of Apollonia, and Heraclitus.[55] The principles of Anaxagoras were the ὁμοιομερείαι or homogeneous particles, and Diogenes the Cynic found in the doctrine of the all-pervasiveness of the elements an excuse for eating flesh. Leucippus, Democritus, and Epicurus are quoted as having taught the doctrine of the atoms and the void.[56]

Matter was the first principle, according to the Egyptians,

[52] X 84 IX 45, 57.

[53] II 17 IX 44 VII 151 III 70 VII 152 IX 11 IX 19 X 99 VII 154 X 103.

[54] III 24 VII 134 I 8 III 69 VII 134 I 3 VIII 25.

[55] III 70, 73 VII 137 VIII 76 IX 19, 22 V 32 I 27 II 1, 3 IX 57, 22.

[56] II 8 VI 73 IX 30, 31, 44 X 35.

from which the four elements were derived. In the system of the Stoics the primary matter was the substratum of all things, and the four elements together constituted matter. For Plato, formless matter received the ideas and so generated substances, etc.[57] A knowledge of cause is given by science, and on this knowledge happiness depends, according to Epicurus, cause having to be distinguished from condition. According to Plato the universe comes from a good cause, and ideas are causes. Archelaus declared heat and cold to be the two causes of becoming.[58] Motion is apparent only, according to Melissus. The Pyrrhoneans denied the reality of motion, and Zeno of Elea was regarded as Skeptical because he wanted to destroy motion. According to Plato man and the soul, and according to the Stoics nature, move of themselves. Alcmaeon has it that the soul is continuously in motion, like the sun, and the Epicureans taught that the atoms are in continual motion. Aristippus and the Cyrenaics described pleasure and pain in terms of smooth and rough motion, and according to Plato the ideas are neither in motion nor at rest.[59] The shape most suitable for motion is the spherical shape, the sphere is the most beautiful of figures among solids, and by various philosophers God, the heaven, the universe, the sun, etc., are declared to be spherical.[60]

Man, the world, etc., are said to be living beings. Philosophy itself was likened by the Stoics to a living creature. Living creatures were produced, according to Anaxagoras, from moisture, heat, and an earthy substance, and later from one another; according to Archelaus, from the earth

[57] I 10 VII 150, 137 III 76, 69.

[58] X 78, 64 III 71, 77 II 16.

[59] IX 24, 99, 72 III 54, 67 VII 149 VIII 83 X 43 II 85, 86 III 64.

[60] VII 140 VIII 35 IX 19, 57, 21 VIII 25, 48 III 71 VII 140. 144 X 74.

when it is heated and throws off slime to serve as nourishment.[61] The sun was kindled that living creatures might possess number. The first impulse of a living creature, said the Stoics, is self-preservation. Men differ from the animals in that the former utter articulate sounds, are rational, and distinguish between right and wrong. All living creatures share the power of memory, natural friendship, fitness of behavior, etc. The question of sacrificing and eating animals was discussed by the Cynics and the Pythagoreans.[62]

Various definitions are given of the "soul": it is "the idea of vital breath diffused in all directions" (Plato); it is "the first entelechy of a natural organic body potentially possessed of life" (Aristotle); it is "a nature capable of perception" (the Stoics); it is "a warm breath" (Zeno, Antipater, Posidonius). Xenophon was the first to declare that the soul is breath; the animals share the possession of a soul with us according to the Pythagoreans; and Parmenides identified soul and mind.[63] The doctrines and various divisions of the soul as formulated by Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and Pythagoras are given, together with a brief statement on the soul by Zeno of Elea and by Democritus and brief quotations from Epicurus.[64] The air, or all things, are filled with souls, according to Pythagoras and Heraclitus, and Thales attributed a soul to inanimate objects. The reason why Plato declared the cosmos animate was because the animate is better than the inanimate.[65] The immortality of the soul was maintained by the Magi, the

[61] III 53 X 74, 123 VII 40 II 9, 17 I 4.

[62] III 74 VII 85 III 107 VII 55, 61, 129 III 15, 81 VII 107 VI 73 VIII 13, 20.

[63] III 67 V 32 VII 156, 157 IX 19 VIII 13 IX 22.

[64] III 67–69, 90 V 32 VII 110, 157 VIII 30–32 IX 29, 44 X 63, 66.

[65] VIII 32 IX 7 I 24 III 71.

Egyptians, Thales, Plato, the Stoics, Pythagoras, and Alcmaeon, and the transmigration of the soul by Plato, Pythagoras, Xenophanes, and Empedocles. The soul was separate from the body according to Plato. Protagoras used to say that the soul was nothing apart from the senses. The Stoics taught that there may be diseases in the soul as well as in the body. A good soul, according to Pythagoras, was a desirable acquisition.[66] There were also a number of sayings about the soul such as that of Bias: "To become strong is nature's work, but to be able to say that which benefits the fatherland is proper to the soul and the reason."[67]

Such then was the treatment of physics by Diogenes Laertius: a collection of opinions, loosely strung together, on the universe, natural phenomena, elements and principles, matter, cause, motion, the spherical shape, living beings, and the soul.

Theology. — The Stoics treated theology as a part of physics. Plato employed theology in his myths as a driving force for ethical living. From the doctrine of Aristotle and the youthful training of Democritus it appears that theology was closely associated with astronomy, and from the experience of Plato in Egypt and the life of Empedocles that it was in addition often found together with medicine.[68] The theology of such poets as Hesiod and Homer was scored by the philosophers Pythagoras, Heraclitus, and Xenophanes. Science was the great deliverer from mythology, according to Epicurus. The philosophy of the barbarians was theological and therefore not to be viewed as genuine philosophy.[69]

[66] VIII 32 IX 7 I 24 III 71 I 8, 11, 24 III 55 VII 156, 157 VIII 21, 28, 38, 83 III 67 VIII 4, 14, 36, 77 III 63 IX 51 VII 115 VIII 31.

[67] I 86, 37 IV 49 VI 5, 65 VII 40.

[68] VII 132, 41 III 79 V 32 IX 34 III 6 VIII 61.

[69] VIII 21 IX 1, 18 X 143, 87, 104, 116 I 1, 2, 5, 6 VIII 3.

Some of Diogenes' philosophers nevertheless observed the customs of religion and were the recipients of dreams and oracles.[70] Pherecydes was a theologian, Pyrrho was made high priest, and Menedemus was so nervous that when he offered frankincense he would miss the censer. The Cynic Diogenes poured scorn on prayers, purifications, and dreams, and Epicurus and Panaetius rejected the whole of divination. Theodorus was known as the atheist, but his follower Bion recanted during an illness; Melissus and Protagoras, besides the Skeptics themselves, were skeptical about the existence of the gods; while Bias, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and Pythagoras are mentioned as favoring theism and a belief in providence.[71] Natural phenomena were deified by the Magi, the Egyptians, and Pythagoras. The Egyptians and the Stoics held anthropocentric views, Xenophanes rejected anthropomorphism, and Orpheus held to anthropopathic conceptions of the gods.[72] A namesake of Socrates and others wrote on the names of the gods. The gods of the philosophers were the gods of Greek mythology, besides whom there were δαίμονες.[73] Religious interpretations of natural phenomena are given. Thus Thales declared the world most beautiful because it is the workmanship of God, and Linus is said to have been slain by the arrow of Apollo; but both the Stoics and Epicurus denied that love was divinely sent.[74]

On the whole, Diogenes' philosophers considered themselves superior to the devotees of religion. Solon looked

[70] II 131 IV 24, 54 VI 4 I 69 VIII 12, 13, 20, 53, 61 VII 149 I 116 III 2, 5 I 28, 106, 115, 120 II 37, 50, 51 V 91 VI 2 VII 2 VIII 8, 21.

[71] I 119 IX 64 II 131 VI 38, 42 VII 149 X 135 II 86, 97, 102, 116 IV 52, 24 IX 24, 51, 84 I 58 III 79 V 32 VII 52, 139 VIII 27.

[72] I 6, 9, 10 VIII 27 I 10 VII 139 IX 19 I 5.

[73] II 47, 106 VII 135 VIII 76 — VII 88 VIII 10 III 2, 39, etc. — VII 151 VIII 33 IX 7, etc.

[74] I 6, 35 VIII 26 IX 7 III 72 I 4, 5, 10, 60, 86, 97 V 32 VII 130 X 118.

upon religion and legislation as of little avail, and Diogenes called the performances at the Dionysia great marvels for morons. Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Aristotle were brought to trial for their impieties, by which they had offended the populace. The wise man is godlike, according to the Stoics; and according to the Cyrenaics, he will not δεισιδαιμονήσειν.[75] Writings on religious topics are attributed to Musaeus, Linus, Pherecydes, Socrates of Cos, Theodorus, Empedocles, Heraclitus, and a namesake of Heraclitus.[76] Some of the sayings of the philosophers had to do with things religious as when to the question of Chilon as to what Zeus was doing Aesop replied, "He is humbling the proud and exalting the humble."[77] Diogenes Laertius, in the epitaphs of which he was the author, employed such religious phrases as "Solon, this holy lawgiver," "the godlike man Aristocles," etc. His own attitude, as expressed in his epigrams, was one of defense of the philosophers against the religionists except for his rebuke of Bion for a return to religious faith.[78]

Astronomy. — Astronomical considerations were included among the physical doctrines in the treatment of the Stoics. The study of astronomy was traced to Thales, the philosophers characterized as astronomers including the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, Thales, a namesake of Pherecydes, Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Plato, Eudoxus, Leucippus, Democritus, and a namesake of Protagoras.[79] Astronomical writings had been composed by Linus, Thales, Eudoxus, and Epicurus.

[75] II 97, 117 IV 54 X 123 I 64 VI 24, 28 II 13, 38, 40 V 8 VII 119 II 91. [76] I 3, 4, 43, 116 II 47, 97 VIII 57 IX 6, 17.

[77] I 69, 86 II 102, 116 III 39 VI 24, 31, 42 VIII 9 I 35, 36, 12, 60, 77, 88 VI 37, 72 VII 180 VI 63, 69.

[78] I 62, 79 III 43, 44 IV 21, 25, 30, 31 — V 8 X 10 I 5, 6, 10 II 97 IV 54.

[79] VII 132, 144–146 II 5 I 23 — I 6, 11, 34, 119 II 5, 10 III 29 VIII 86 IX 33, 34, 56.

Besides the invention of the sundial and the gnomon, Diogenes Laertius recorded a number of astronomical discoveries. Thus Thales discovered Ursa Minor and the seasons of the year, a namesake of Bion affirmed there were places where the night lasts six months and the day six months, and Pythagoras declared the identity of the evening and the morning star.[80] The trial of Anaxagoras exemplified how early astronomical doctrines had come into conflict with religion and what sufferings philosophers were willing to undergo for their doctrines. Among the astronomical opinions recorded by Diogenes Laertius was the doctrine of Plato that the heavenly bodies originated in the interest of the genesis of time. The story of Thales falling into a ditch while observing the stars is illustrative of the anecdotal interest in astronomy, and the ascription of so many astronomical achievements to him is indicative of the tendency on the part of Laertius to disparage the achievements of the ancient barbarians.[81] For the rest, the astronomical views of the philosophers were grouped under the heads: sun, solstice, moon, and stars.[82]

The Magi are said to have deified the sun, the Egyptians the sun and the moon, and Pythagoras the sun, moon, and stars. Thales predicted a solar eclipse; the phenomenon of the solar eclipse was explained by the Stoics and by Heraclitus and asserted to be of rare occurrence by Leucippus. The size and the substance of the sun were discussed by Thales, Anaximander, Euripides, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, the Stoics, and Empedocles; and the course of the sun was described by Thales, the Stoics, Heraclitus, and Leucippus.[83] According to Cleanthes the sun is the ruling power of the world; ac-

[80] I 119 II 1 I 23, 27 IV 58 VIII 14.

[81] II 10 III 74 I 34 II 10 VI 39 I 11, 23.

[82] I 4 II 10 III 74 VIII 27, 77, 83.

[83] I 9, 10 VIII 27 VII 146 IX 10, 33 I 24 II 1, 10, 12, 17 VII 144 VIII 77 I 24 VII 144 IX 10, 30, 33.

cording to Pythagoras the sun's rays penetrate through the ether and quicken all things; and Parmenides has it that the generation of men proceeded from the sun and that heat and cold, of which all things consist, surpass the sun. Brief comments on the solstice are given in the accounts of Thales, Anaximander, and Epicurus.[84]

Lunar eclipses were explained by the Egyptians, the Stoics, Heraclitus, and Leucippus; the size of the moon was discussed by Thales and Empedocles; the shining of the moon was explained by Anaximander, the Stoics, Pythagoras, and Leucippus; the orbit of the moon was described by the Stoics and by Leucippus and its composition by the Stoics and by Democritus.[85] Alcmaeon taught that the moon is eternal and Anaxagoras that there were dwellings and hills and ravines on the moon. According to Favorinus, Democritus doubted the originality of the views of Anaxagoras concerning the sun and the moon.[86]

Descriptions of the substance of the stars were given by the Egyptians and Leucippus; of their motion by Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, and the Stoics; and of their distance by Heraclitus; and explanations were given of the milky way, comets, shooting stars, etc., by Anaxagoras and the Stoics.[87]

In brief, the Laertian treatment of astronomy is a compilation of a few historical and doctrinal notes. Still less material is offered on mathematics and medicine.

Mathematics. — According to the Stoics, that part of physics which deals with the universe may be divided into two subdivisions, with one of which mathematicians are also concerned, the other belonging to the physicists alone; and

[84] VII 139 VIII 27 IX 22 I 23, 24 II 1 X 79 I 11 VII 146 IX 10, 33.

[85] I 11 VII 146 IX 10, 33 — I 24 VIII 77 — II 1 VII 145 VIII 27 IX 33 — VII 144 IX 30, 33 — VII 145 IX 44.

[86] VIII 83 II 8 IX 34.

[87] I 11 IX 30, 32 II 3, 9 VII 144 IX 10 II 9 VII 153.

the part dealing with the subject of causation may be similarly divided, medical inquiries having a share in one of these subdivisions and the other being claimed by the mathematicians also. Astronomy was associated with mathematics in the philosophy of the Egyptians, Thales, and Eudoxus, the last named being the author of astronomical and geometrical treatises.[88]

Thales and Democritus learned geometry from the Egyptians, who claimed to have invented it as well as arithmetic and astronomy. Plato learned geometry from a namesake of Theodorus in Cyrene, Arcesilaus from Hipparchus, Eudoxus from Archytas, and Lacydes studied geometry late. Bion made sport of music and geometry, and Socrates held that geometry ought to be studied up to the point of practical usefulness, while Aristotle declared the soul takes in light from mathematics as sight does from the surroundings.[89]

Mathematical achievements are credited to Thales, who measured the height of the pyramids and was the rival of Pythagoras for the honor of having first inscribed a right-angled triangle in a circle; to Pythagoras, who brought theoretical geometry to perfection by developing the discoveries of Euphorbus and Moeris; and to Archytas, who first brought mechanics into a system, employed mechanical motion in geometrical construction, and discovered the cube. The use of definitions in mathematics, begun by Pythagoras, was extended by Socrates and his disciples and afterwards by Aristotle and the Stoics, according to Favorinus; and a few sentences on the soul, its arithmetical first principle, and its relation to the circle of the same and the circle of the other, are evidence of the mathematical learning of Plato.[90]

[88] VII 132, 133 I 11, 22 VIII 86, 88.
[89] I 11, 22 IX 35 II 103 III 6 IV 32 VIII 86 IV 60, 53 II 32 V 17.
[90] I 23, 22, 25 VIII 11, 83, 48 III 67, 69.

Medicine. — The account of Plato's cure by Egyptian priests and of his division of medicine into five species; the classification of medical inquiries in their relation to physics by the Stoics; the ascription of medical works to Alcmaeon and Chrysippus (the grandson of Eudoxus); and the characterization of Pythagoras, Empedocles, Pausanias, Eudoxus, Menodotus of Nicomedea, and ten namesakes of the philosophers as physicians, complete the scientific lore of Diogenes Laertius.[91]

Ethics

The praise of ethics. — In the interest of the attainment of the good life the great *desideratum* was a philosophy of life. Ethics is that branch of philosophy, according to Diogenes Laertius, which is concerned with life and with all that has to do with us. For Epicurus, ethics deals with things to be sought and things to be avoided, with human life, and with the end-in-chief.[92] As a separate discipline ethics had been introduced by Socrates, although his teacher Archelaus the physicist had also treated of ethics; the Cyrenaics, the Cynics, and Ariston the Bald devoted exclusive attention to ethics, rejecting in its favor both physics and logic; and ethics was the special concern of the Cynics and the Stoics, who resembled each other in seeking to lead a life according to virtue.[93] The supreme importance of ethics was attested by the example, influence, and precepts of the philosophers as well as by the customs of living practised by such schools as the Cynics and the Pythagoreans and the practical measures observed even by the Stoics.[94]

The eminent ethicists. — According to the prologue of

[91] III 7, 85 VII 133 VIII 83, 89 VIII 11, 58, 61, 86 IX 116.
[92] V 30, 19 VI 103 VII 30 I 18 X 30.
[93] II 16, 45 III 56 II 92 VI 103 VII 160 VI 104.
[94] II 29 VIII 56, 22 VI 105 VIII 33 IX 108.

Diogenes Laertius, one type of philosopher was called Moralists, and there were ten ethical schools. The principal ethicists in his treatment seem to have been: Socrates (the first ethicist), the Cyrenaics, the impressive Stilpo, Plato (the writer of ethical dialogues), Aristotle, the Cynics (who taught a way of life), the Stoics, Pythagoras, Democritus, the Pyrrhoneans, and Epicurus.[95] In addition, Diogenes commented briefly on the ethics of Potamo, Aristippus, Theophrastus, Antisthenes, Monimus, the heterodox Stoics, and Heraclitus,[96] and noted in the form of "sayings" the ethical opinions of the sages, Menedemus, Bion, Antisthenes, Diogenes, etc. Ethical writings are ascribed to Plato, Chrysippus, and Epicurus, and the Stoic subdivisions of ethics are indicated. The principal ethical controversies were waged within the Cyrenaic and Stoic schools, and the interpretation of Homer was an ethical issue of interest to Diogenes Laertius.[97]

Ethical doctrines. — One of the most important conceptions in the various ethical systems was that of the "end." The "end" was variously defined as assimilation to God (by Plato), life made perfect in all virtue (by Potamo), the exercise of virtue in a completed life (by Aristotle), life according to virtue (by the Cynics), a life of indifference to everything that is neither virtue nor vice (by Ariston), life in agreement with nature (by Zeno), to act with good reason in the selection of what is natural (by Dionysius the Stoic), to live in the performance of all-befitting actions (by Archedemus), knowledge (by Herillus), pleasure (by Aristippus, Dionysius, and Epicurus), tranquillity or ἀταραξία (by Democritus, the Skeptics, and Epicurus), and suspen-

[95] I 14, 17, 18 II 20, 45, 91, 94, 96, 99, 116 III 50 V 30 VI 103 VII 84 VIII 56 IX 37 X 139.

[96] I 21 II 85 V 41 VI 11, 83 VII 160, 165, 166 IX 15.

[97] III 50, 80 VII 199–202 X 29, 86, 122, 139 VII 84 II 11.

sion of judgment (by the Skeptics). Herillus of Carthage seemed to be the only one who admitted at times that the end "shifted according to varying circumstances and objects," but he too distinguished between the end-in-chief, which only the wise may seek, and the subordinate ends, at which even the unwise may aim.[98]

The doctrine that virtue is sufficient for happiness was shared by Plato, Antisthenes, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and the Stoics generally, but was denied by Aristotle, Plato also considering the need of "instruments," but declaring that the wise man can be happy without these things. The two last named also gave lists of the constituents of happiness. The question of the relation between happiness and pleasure was debated between the various Cyrenaic schools.[99] Anaxarchus was called the happy man, King Antigonus had to own himself inferior in happiness to the philosopher Zeno, and the Epicureans maintained that the wise man can be happy even on the rack though the gods alone had perfect happiness. Thales, Solon, and Chilon uttered sententious sayings about happiness, and, by concluding his book with the *Sovran Maxims* of Epicurus, Diogenes Laertius made "the end of his work coincide with the beginning of happiness."[100]

Pleasure was favored in the ethical doctrines of the Cyrenaics, Dionysius the Renegade, Eudoxus, and the Epicureans, but was assigned a subordinate place by Plato, Theophrastus, Antisthenes, Diogenes, the Stoics, Democritus, and the Skeptics. As against the Epicureans, the Cyrenaics taught that pleasure is a state of motion and not of rest, that pleasure is good even if it proceeds from un-

[98] VII 84 X 30 III 78 I 21 V 30 VI 104 VII 160, 87, 88, 37, 165 II 85, 87 VII 166 X 11, 137 IX 45, 107 X 85, 128 VII 165.

[99] III 78 VI 11 VII 89, 189, 127 V 31 III 78, 98 V 30 II 87, 91, 94, 96.

[100] IX 60 VII 7 X 118, 121 I 37, 50, 73 X 138.

seemly conduct, that pleasure is not mere removal of pain, that pleasure is not derived from the memory or expectation of good, that bodily pleasures are better than mental pleasures, etc.[101]

Virtue (ἀρετή) was variously defined as harmonious disposition, the perfection of anything, the beautiful, harmony; by some it was classified; its importance was duly stressed.[102] The main questions agitated about virtue were: whether it exists, whether it is sufficient for happiness, whether it can be lost, and whether it is teachable and by what means.[103] One of a few sayings recorded about virtue is that of Antisthenes: "Virtue is a weapon that cannot be taken away."[104] Among the individual virtues for which definitions and sayings are given were courage and justice.[105] The Stoics maintained that justice exists by nature, but Archelaus, the Cyrenaics, and the Theodoreans that it exists by convention only.[106]

The "good" is one and the only existent, according to Euclides. Socrates declared the good to be knowledge; the Stoics, that from which advantage comes or (according to Athenaeus) the mind's virtue.[107] Classifications of goods were made by Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics.[108] Among things called "good" were God and the universe, toil, pleas-

[101] II 86–93 VII 166 VIII 88 X 34, 128–130 — III 91 V 41 VI 2, 3, 67 VII 30, 86, 114 IX 45, 79 — II 86–93 X 136–138.

[102] VII 89, 90, 101 VIII 33 — III 90 VII 90, 126 V 31 — II 33 III 18 VI 104 VII 11.

[103] II 91 VII 91 — VII 128, 189 III 78 — VI 105 — VI 10, 105 V 31 VII 93 — II 91, 96 V 30 VI 11 VII 46.

[104] II 32 I 92 IV 48 VI 12, 54.

[105] III 90 VII 92 I 6 IV 50 — III 91, 79, 83, 13 V 21 X 150 I 6, 11 VI 12 VIII 33 II 35.

[106] VII 128 II 16, 93, 99.

[107] II 106, 31 VII 94, 30.

[108] II 80, 81, 105 V 30 VII 95, 96.

ure, pain, luxury, wisdom and justice, and health.[109] In various sayings the good was commended and evil condemned.[110] It was considered within the province of philosophy to make one "good and noble" (*καλὸς κἀγαθός*).[111] The Cynics, Ariston, and Herillus believed in a realm of the indifferent between virtue and vice. The Stoics did not believe in such a realm, but pronounced the indifferent to be that which did not contribute to happiness or misery and that which was without power to stir inclination or aversion.[112]

In addition to these problems of the end, of happiness, of pleasure and pain, of virtue, and of good and evil such problems as friendship and the emotions belonged to ethics as conceived by Diogenes Laertius.[113] But the fundamental problem appears to have been that of the teachability of virtue.

Politics. — Whether the wise man should take part in politics was a debated question answered affirmatively by Plato and Chrysippus, negatively by Epicurus, and discriminatingly by Socrates and the school of Anniceris.[114] A namesake of Aeschines was a political writer; Plato, Aristotle, Demetrius, Empedocles, and Heraclitus touched on politics in their writings; and political speeches were composed by a namesake of Aristippus and by Demetrius.[115] Among those active politically were Thales, Solon, Chilon, Stilpo, Menedemus, Demetrius, many of the pupils of Diogenes, Eudoxus, Melissus, and Zeno of Elea. Anaxagoras experienced the help of Pericles in his trial. The political

[109] III 72 VII 172 X 6, 129 VI 2 II 69, 98 X 120.
[110] I 35, 77, 93, 88, 104, etc. — I 6, 60, 70, 78, 88, 92, etc.
[111] II 48 VI 8, 27 I 56.
[112] VI 105 VII 165, 127, 104.
[113] VII 124, 111, 116.
[114] III 78 VII 121 X 10 II 29, 89.
[115] II 64 III 48 V 28, 80 VIII 57 IX 5 II 104 V 75.

experiences of Plato are described with some detail. Antisthenes and the Pythagoreans are said to have laid political foundations.[116] Among those who shunned politics were Plato, Arcesilaus, Empedocles, and Heraclitus, the last named preferring to play knucklebones with the boys.[117] The political philosophy of Plato is said to have been patterned after that of Socrates, and Plato gave various classifications of laws. Diogenes and Heraclitus too commented on the necessity of laws, and the Cyrenaics derived one kind of pleasure from the prosperity of one's country.[118] In general, the political attitude of the philosophers seems to have been one of cosmopolitanism, although Pythagoras advocated a concern for one's mother country and Diogenes Laertius defended Epicurus on the ground of the latter's love for his country.[119]

Dialectic

The praise of dialectic. — "The province of dialectic" is formed, according to Diogenes Laertius, by the processes of reasoning employed in both physics and ethics. The Stoics called attention to this relationship between the branches of philosophy "to establish the point that the wise man alone is the dialectician." The Cyrenaics (according to one account) abandoned physics because of its uncertainty, fastening on logical inquiries because of their utility. Aristotle elaborated logic not as an independent science, but ὡς ὄργανον, and with the Epicureans canonic formed the introduction to their system.[120] The usefulness of dialectic was maintained by the Cyrenaics and by the Stoics while

[116] VI 76 II 13 III 18–24 VI 15 VIII 3, etc.
[117] III 23 IV 39 VIII 63 IX 2, 3.
[118] III 8, 86, 103, 104 VI 72 IX 1 II 89.
[119] II 7, 98 VI 72 VIII 50 X 10.
[120] I 18 VII 83 II 92 V 28 X 30.

its uselessness was asserted by the Cyrenaics (according to another account), Menedemus (although a Platonist), the Cynics, Ariston the Bald, and the Epicureans. According to the Stoics dialectic was itself a virtue, for the practise of which traits of character were requisite that were the product of no mean ethical achievements.[121] Socrates and Alexinus called attention to the uselessness of eristic, of which Stilpo was a master and the semblance of which was introduced into Plato's system by Arcesilaus.[122]

The eminent dialecticians. — "Dialecticians" was the name designating those philosophers who were occupied περὶ τῶν λόγων τεθρείαν. Language was called "dialectical" by Plato when it proceeded by means of question and answer. As a separate discipline, dialectic is said to have gone back to Zeno of Elea or to Plato, who by introducing dialectic brought philosophy to perfection.[123] Menedemus excelled in inventing objections, Arcesilaus was devoted to dialectic, Zeno was an exact reasoner on all subjects, Protagoras was a quibbler, and Chrysippus was so renowned for dialectic that it was thought if the gods employed dialectic they would adopt that of Chrysippus.[124] Others whose dialectical doctrines are given include Potamo, Socrates, Euclides, Aristotle, Lyco, Antisthenes, Diogenes, Monimus, Hipparchia, Ariston, Parmenides, Pyrrho, and Timon as well as Pythagoras, Epicharmus, Alcmaeon, Democritus, and others, on whose logical opinions there are a few comments. Panthoides and Philo are named as teachers of Lyco and Zeno, respectively, and Diodorus as a fellow student of Zeno. The Stoic logic is treated in great detail, the canonic of Epicurus received a comparatively extended treatment, and

[121] II 92 VII 44, 47 II 92, 135 VI 103 VII 160, 161 X 30 VII 46–48.

[122] II 30, 135, 117 IV 28. [123] I 17 III 87 I 18 III 56.

[124] II 134 IV 33 VII 15 IX 52 VII 180.

Platonism is especially associated with dialectic.[125] Singled out as authors of logical writings were Diodorus, Plato, Chrysippus, and Epicurus,[126] and a number of pioneer achievements marked the history of dialectic such as the discovery of the veiled figure, the horned one, the Achilles, etc.[127] From the writings of Plato and of Xenophon it appears that Socrates "had the skill to draw his arguments from facts," and the refutation of the doctrine of Persaeus concerning the refusal of the wise man to hold mere opinion by his perplexity when he did not know to which of a pair of twins to give a sum of money deposited with him is one of a dozen stories on dialectic.[128] The subdivisions of dialectic adopted by the Stoics are noted, as well as the less extensive classifications made by Plato and Aristotle.[129]

Dialectical doctrines. — Diogenes Laertius was fond of alluding to famous arguments and fallacies employed by eminent philosophers such as the Achilles attributed to Parmenides and to Zeno of Elea, the veiled figure and the horned one ascribed to Diodorus, the argument that the hierophant who divulged the mysteries to the uninitiated is impious and similar fallacies credited to Chrysippus, etc. The Stoics distinguished between arguments and moods, the combinations of the two being called symbolical arguments. The Stoics clasified arguments as conclusive and inconclusive, conclusive proper and syllogistic, true and false, possible and impossible, necessary and not necessary, demonstrable and indemonstrable, and insoluble.[130]

[125] V 68 VII 16, 25 — VII 43–83 X 30–34 II 30, 135 III 50, 56 IV 28. [126] II 111 III 51 VII 198 X 30.

[127] II 111 IV 28 IX 23, 51, 78.

[128] II 29, 30, 135 III 35 VI 37, 39 VII 20, 25, 162, 182 IX 38.

[129] VII 41, 43 III 50, 53 V 28.

[130] II 111 IX 23, 29 VII 76–82. See also II 29, 106, 108, 134 III 35 IX 53 VI 37, 39 IX 51.

Plato's technique of proof involved the frequent use of induction which proceeded — for purposes of refutation — by way of contradiction and — in the establishment of his own views — by way of agreement, dealing in the latter case with general propositions based on particular propositions rather than with particular propositions alone as in rhetoric. Other examples of proof are that of Posidonius for the existence of virtue by reference to Socrates, Diogenes, Antisthenes, and their followers, and that of the Stoics for the world as a living being since " a living creature is better than a non-living creature and there is nothing better than the world." Chrysippus offered to find proofs for any doctrine presented to him, Euclides was wont to attack not the premises but the conclusion, and the Skeptics said that the same thing does not convince every one.[131]

The question of the possibility of knowledge interested Diogenes Laertius not a little.[132] Several of the philosophers had distinguished between truth and opinion,[133] and in the question of the criterion of truth some favored the senses,[134] others the reason;[135] still others admitted a plurality of standards;[136] while the Skeptics accepted neither.[137]

The distinction between objects of sense and of thought made by Plato was derived by him from Epicharmus, to whose influence therefore he owed his " doctrine of ideas," according to which the ideas were the causes and principles whereby the world of natural objects is what it is. The

[131] III 53–56 VII 91, 143, 179 II 106 IX 91.
[132] I 23 II 92 VII 160, 162 VIII 83 IX 71–73.
[133] I 122 III 40, 79 V 28 VI 83 VII 71, 162 IX 22, 51, 72, 95 X 34.
[134] II 66, 92 VII 54 IX 51 X 31, 68, 82.
[135] II 95 III 10, 12, 64 VIII 30 IX 22.
[136] I 21 V 29 VII 49, 51, 52, 54, 157.
[137] IX 91, 92, 94, 96, 106.

prowess of Stilpo, who was δεινός in eristic, was shown in this that he "used to demolish even the ideas" by his subtle argumentation![138]

Terms and classifications. — In the Stoic division of philosophy as well as in the Platonic and Aristotelian doctrine, rhetoric was associated with dialectic.[139] The detailed treatment of the Stoic dialectic also exemplifies the importance ascribed to questions of grammar.[140] Besides contrasting philosophy with rhetoric throughout his book, Diogenes Laertius showed a special interest in the use of terminology and in various divisions and classifications. Thus he speaks of Epicurus as using the ordinary terms for things, of Chrysippus as writing a treatise vindicating Zeno's use of terminology, of Crantor as clever at inventing terms, of Arcesilaus as fond of distinguishing meanings of terms, and of Zeno and Plato as being the first to employ certain terms in philosophy.[141] Diogenes Laertius traced the derivation of such words as Eumolpidae, Zoroaster, philosophy, etc.,[142] and gave definitions for: philosopher, Sophist, dogmatist, Skeptic, dialogue, dialectic, induction.[143] Some of the Stoics included "the science of definitions" in their logical theory, and various definitions are quoted from the philosophers, such as Aristotle's definition of hope as a waking dream, etc.[144] At the end of Plato's life Diogenes listed over thirty examples of the way in which Plato divided things ("according to Aristotle"). Similar classifications are found in the chapter on the Stoics and in other parts of

[138] III 8–16, 64, 76, 77 II 119.
[139] VII 41–43 III 54 V 28.
[140] VII 55–68, etc.
[141] X 13 VII 121 IV 27, 33 VII 25, 18 III 63, 24.
[142] I 3, 8, 12 VI 3 VII 65, 108, etc.
[143] I 5, 12, 16 III 51, 48, 53.
[144] VII 41, 42 VIII 48 I 105 II 1 III 19, 81 V 18, 33 VI 3, 40 VII 41, 88 X 33.

the book as when Metrodorus divided things into such as are procurable by money, like a house, and such as are procurable by time and effort, like education.[145]

Diogenes Laertius as Doxographer

The eminent doctrinaires. — Apart from the sages in Book I, Diogenes Laertius has given doctrinal accounts for about one half of the philosophers treated by him. After the chapter on Socrates in Book II there are doctrinal comments on Aristippus, Euclides, Stilpo, and Menedemus only. In Book IV there are no expositions of the views of the Academics except that the views of Speusippus, Arcesilaus, and Carneades are barely mentioned, as when Speusippus is said to have adhered faithfully to Plato's doctrines. In Book V the opinions of Aristotle and of Theophratus are barely sketched, especially the logic of Aristotle receiving but scant treatment, and Strato is said to have excelled in physics. In Book VI there is, besides a goodly number of the sayings of the famous Cynics, a brief outline of the doctrines the Cynics had in common. In Book VII the views of Dionysius and Sphaerus received but little consideration. In Book VIII the opinions of Epicharmus, Archytas, and Eudoxus are barely mentioned. In Book IX there is a comparatively earnest endeavor to present the doctrines of the Sporadic philosophers and the Skeptics except in the cases of Anaxarchus and Timon. Those whose views in all three branches of philosophy are given include Potamo, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Democritus, the Skeptics, and Epicurus. Physics and ethics are represented in the chapters on Pythagoras and Heraclitus, and physics and dialectic in the chapters on Zeno of Elea and Protagoras. Ethics is emphasized in the sayings throughout the book and in the

[145] III 80–109, 53 VI 95 VII 92, 93, 94, 110, 126 IX 54.

comments on the Cyrenaics and Cynics. Only the physical opinions are noted in the cases of most of the Pre-Socratic, Pythagorean, and Sporadic philosophers. The most extensive treatments are accorded the teachings of Plato, the Stoics, and Epicurus, and the teachings of the Skeptics, besides being traced to more recent times than the doctrines of any other school, are contrasted at length with the teachings of the dogmatists.

The cataloguing interest. — The interest of Diogenes Laertius is plainly one of collecting and cataloguing dead theories of a remote past rather than of tracing the origin and the career of the ideas recorded by him or of following out their implications. His aim was to preserve the views of the ancient Greek philosophers on the topics according to which it had become customary to classify philosophical opinions and in a manner in which those views could easily have been memorized by his readers. The tradition in which Greek philosophy had become crystallized was to be preserved in the form determined by the customary classification in order that the opinions of the eminent philosophers might be readily accessible to posterity. The solutions which the great thinkers of old had attained were all-important in the mind of Diogenes, not the causes that had stimulated them to think about the problems of which their opinions were the attempted solutions or the ways in which they arrived at their solutions or the consequences those solutions had for themselves and for those who were influenced by them. The starting-point for the reflections of Diogenes' readers was evidently to be the opinions of one whose reputation as a philosopher had been established, and such opinions were given not in their original form, setting, and completeness, but in the terms of a few conceptions that were considered fundamental in physics, logic, and ethics. In view of the stress laid by Diogenes throughout his work

on the practical benefits of philosophy, a survey of his doctrinal accounts cannot therefore but raise the question how anyone who might have learned all the philosophical opinions collected by the diligent compiler would thereby have become a philosopher. It would seem, in point of fact, that as little as a knowledge of the notes of Diogenes Laertius on medicine, mathematics, astronomy, education, music, art, or military tactics would have made anyone a physician, mathematician, astronomer, educator, musician, artist, or military genius, just so little would a knowledge of the views he has preserved on physics, theology, ethics, politics, dialectic, or rhetoric have made anyone a physical, religious, ethical, political, dialectical, or Sophistic philosopher.

Moreover, it is difficult to see how the study of the various particular systems of philosophy presented by Diogenes Laertius would have made of any reader an Eclectic, Cyrenaic, Platonist, Aristotelian, Cynic, Stoic, Pythagorean, Skeptic, or Epicurean, etc., if a memorization of the outlines of the Laertian doctrinal accounts, such as was implicitly suggested in the form of Diogenes' " introductory handbook " and explicitly recommended for his own system by Epicurus,[146] could not even have yielded an understanding of the ways in which the philosophers of the past had come to " philosophize " as they did. Nor could the very manner in which the main purpose of the book was expressed — to further an appreciation of Platonism — promise much toward the achievement of that purpose: " Now as you are an enthusiastic Platonist, and rightly so, and as you eagerly seek out that philosopher's doctrines in preference to all others, I have thought it necessary to give some account of the nature of his discourses, the arrangement of the dialogues, and the method of his inductive procedure, as far as possible in an elementary manner and in main outline, in

[146] VII 48 X 35, 36.

order that the facts I have collected respecting his life may not suffer by the omission of his doctrine." [147]

Again, the ethical value of the doctrinal expositions of Diogenes Laertius, though asserted on occasion, is not made clear. There is little or no specific indication of the relation between the opinions and the actions of the great philosophers. Not even the practical value of the main ethical systems, those of Plato, Aristotle, the Cynics, the Stoics, Pythagoras, and the Epicureans, is pointed out except that the sentence introducing the *Sovran Maxims* of Epicurus may be interpreted as a commendation of the Epicurean ethics (X 138).

Furthermore, the reader is not informed in what respects the great systems of philosophy represented achievements of the philosophical enterprise or redounded to the glorification of the authors who had framed them or of the Greeks among whom they originated or of the age which had given them birth. The doctrines of Diogenes' eminent philosophers are merely recorded in a mechanical, detached, and external manner.

In fine, in the doxographical sections of Diogenes' book we may be said to have a museum of philosophical ideas which are pinned like beetles on pegs in glass cases to be looked at and admired, a compilation which is no more capable of furnishing an understanding of the history of those ideas than the mere examination of beetles under a glass will yield an understanding of the life of the beetle. If philosophic opinions may be regarded as spectacles through

[147] III 47. Freudenthal (*Hellenistische Studien,* III, 268) indeed preferred the prologue of Albinus as a better example of the efforts made in the first centuries of our era to understand Plato than the compilation of Diogenes, " dessen Mischung verschiedenster Quellen wenig geeignet ist, ein klares Bild von der kritischen Art seiner oder früherer Zeiten zu gewähren."

which philosophers view the world, Diogenes may be said to bid us look *at* the spectacles, not *through* them. If philosophy may be compared to a searchlight, then for Diogenes Laertius it is one which is itself displayed instead of being made to throw light on dark places.

Chapter VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS BOOK

A Treatment of Greek Philosophy

The bases for an evaluation. — Any attempt to evaluate the book of Diogenes Laertius must first of all take account of the use that has been made of it as a source book both for Greek philosophy and for works of antiquity which are known to us only through the references to them contained in this document and in the writings of other authors who have alluded to those works. Such an inquiry will reveal that whatever significance may properly be attached to the book must be sought in other directions; namely, in the ways in which it reflects the main tendencies of philosophical writings in the centuries preceding its appearance, the tastes and inclinations of the readers to whom it was addressed, and the characteristic traits of its author.

The professed aim of the book. — Diogenes Laertius plainly intended his work to be regarded as a treatment of Greek philosophy, though he could scarcely have dreamed that his compilation would survive all the similar compilations that had been made on the same theme so far as they appear to have been known to him, or that, centuries afterwards, his *opus* would exercise a determining influence on nearly all histories of Greek philosophy that would be written. Whether the author has, however, succeeded in giving us an adequate treatment of Greek philosophy and whether therefore the reliance that has been placed upon him has been justified may be established, for purposes of illustration

and recapitulation, by a comparison of his direct references to the dialogues of Plato [1] with the dialogues themselves. That such a comparison would provide a fair test of the success or failure of Diogenes Laertius may be inferred from the express desire of the author to furnish a reliable account of Plato (IV 1).

Its fragmentariness and unreliability. — The only accurate references of Diogenes to the dialogues of Plato concern the mention of names and other trivial data. Thus Diogenes has stressed no less than three times the fact that Plato mentioned Myson instead of Periander among the seven sages in the *Protagoras*. Diogenes has rightly discerned that according to Plato Socrates did treat Anytus as a fool and drink the hemlock " after much noble discourse." But such observations could easily have been made also by one who had not read the dialogues at first hand.[2] Diogenes shows no appreciation of the place occupied in Plato's dramas by the various types of persons " mentioned " or of the literary qualities or dominant interests of the dialogues.

Many of the references of Diogenes do not even manifest a regard for the immediate context in the original writings from which the references have supposedly been taken. Thus Dionysius is mentioned in the *Rivals,* but not in token of the gratitude of Plato to his *quondam* teacher, but only in the first sentence to introduce the scene at which the dialogue is supposed to have taken place. The Eleatic Palamedes mentioned in the *Phaedrus* may have been Zeno, but Plato's description of Zeno's " art of speaking " was entirely ignored by Diogenes Laertius. The passage in which Plato, according to Diogenes, left the truth to gods and sons of gods, does not prove the Skepticism of Plato, but is a humorous allusion to the genealogies of the gods in-

[1] See Chapter II, note 219.

[2] *Protagoras* 343 A; *Meno* 95 A; *Phaedo.*

vented by the ancients. The commendation of truth in the *Laws* is not an expression of Plato's esteem for the truth, but a comment made by one of the interlocutors in the midst of a discussion concerning the usefulness of the belief in the happiness of the just apart from the truth or falsity of that belief. Plato's supposed disapproval of oversleeping in the *Laws* occurs in a passage in which it is said that the free man no less than the slave ought to lead a wakeful, active, and useful life. The story of the education of Cyrus is not declared a fiction in the *Laws*, but Cyrus, who had not received a right education and did not devote his attention to his household, is said to have entrusted the education of his children to women. The alleged denial of Plato that the Corinthian Periander was the sage may have been a conclusion drawn from the passage in the *Republic* where Periander is designated as representative of the type of person to whom the theory might be ascribed that justice consists in doing good to one's friends and harm to one's enemies.[3]

Frequently ideas are read into the dialogues by Diogenes Laertius which are not even suggested in the original writings. Thus there is no evidence that Socrates made Lysis virtuous, diverted Euthyphro from his purpose, saw no use in the hairsplitting of Euclides, or sent Theaetetus away fired with a divine impulse. Nor is there any evidence that Plato wrote his dialogues out of rivalry with Xenophon or presented the doctrine of immortality in the *Phaedo* as his own view, or any truth in the statements that Plato abused Aristippus in the *Phaedo* and spoke of Archytas in the *Republic* as the first to discover the cube. The claims that Plato set out the speech of Lysias word for word in the *Phaedrus* and that the *Republic* of Plato was found included in the *Controversies* of Protagoras belong to those assertions

[3] *Phaedrus* 261 D; *Timaeus* 40 D; *Laws* 663 E, 808 B, 649 C; *Republic* I, 336 A.

of Diogenes Laertius which we have no means of verifying.[4]

Not a few of the references of Diogenes Laertius are made in direct contradiction to the dialogues. In the *Theaetetus* the teaching of Protagoras is not interpreted as being that the soul is nothing apart from the senses, but that knowledge is perception; in the same dialogue not the father, but only the mother of Socrates is mentioned; and in the *Symposium* Socrates is pictured not as wearing fine clothes, but merely as having put on his sandals. In the *Protagoras* the saying that "even the gods do not fight against necessity" is attributed not to Pittacus, but to Simonides, and Protagoras is not said to have been the first to use in discussion the argument of Antisthenes that contradiction is impossible, but Socrates is presented as refuting the proposition of Dionysodorus that there is no such thing as falsehood, a thesis "maintained and employed by the disciples of Protagoras and others before them."[5]

The classification according to which Diogenes Laertius has arranged the titles of the dialogues (III 49–51) was based on an interest in education and on the division of philosophy into physics, logic, ethics, and politics. This classification was made in opposition to other classifications, the terms of which Diogenes considered "better suited to the stage than to philosophy." Hence Plato is characterized, not as a dramatist, but as a dogmatist "where he has a firm grasp" and as a Skeptic where "the subject is obscure." Had Diogenes Laertius, however, been more favorably inclined to the other viewpoint, his treatment of Plato would of necessity have been altered. At any rate, it seems safe to conclude that the presentation of Plato given by Diogenes Laertius was controlled, not by an analysis of the writings

[4] *Phaedo* 59 C; *Republic* 528 B; *Phaedrus* 230 E.

[5] *Theaetetus* 151 E, 149; *Symposium* 174 A; *Protagoras* 286 C.

of Plato, but by Diogenes' own interests and by a classificatory scheme into which all that seemed appropriate to say about Plato was made to fit.

Moreover, the doctrinal exposition inserted between the explanation of the critical marks affixed to the works of Plato and the collection of Platonic divisions at the end of Book III was based, so far as the writings of Plato are concerned, entirely on the *Timaeus*,[6] and was colored by Stoic teachings.[7] Thus the definition of the soul, the doctrine of the sphericity of the maker of the universe, the formula *θεὸν καὶ ὕλην*, the doctrines of the end, of the sufficiency of virtue, and of the wise man, the expression " consistent and in accord with nature," and the teaching of the dissolution of the universe into the Deity (which is rejected), are elements of Stoicism which found their way into the Laertian exposition of the doctrines of Plato.[8]

The fragmentariness and unreliability which characterized the references of Diogenes Laertius to the dialogues of Plato are typical of his treatment of the Greek philosophers of old who are represented in his book. Diogenes did not endeavor to interpret the lives and opinions of his philosophers in the light of the motives controlling those philosophers; he did not seek to discover the ideas that were basic in their thinking or to trace the development of such ideas in the reasonings of the philosophers; he did not attempt to relate the work of the philosophers to the forces influencing them

[6] See the footnotes in Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius*, I, 336–46.

[7] Praechter has shown that in the Platonic tradition, designated by him as " Middle Platonism," the acceptance or rejection of Stoic ideas was a common strain. See Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, 12th ed. (1926), 554, 555. The influence of Stoicism on the Greek doxographers has been stressed by Diels (*Doxographi Graeci*, 77, 106, 167, 224, etc.). See also Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophers*, p. 142, on the Laertian treatment of Heraclitus.

[8] III 67, 72, 76, 78, 79, 72.

or to the movements influenced by them in turn. His interpretations of the lives and opinions of the eminent philosophers were made in the light of his own interests; he sought for the expression of ideas on topics that were fundamental in his own scheme; he viewed the opinions of the philosophers as so many pronouncements of isolated truths, rather than as integral parts of ways of looking at the universe and at life; and the only relations he could conceive of as existing between the philosophers were personal relations or the acceptance or rejection of doctrines.

Its inadequacy. — As a treatment of Greek philosophy, therefore, the book of Diogenes Laertius cannot be accepted as an objective account, but must be judged as having been determined by extraneous influences in the light of which alone it may be properly estimated. While kernels of historical truth no doubt found their way into the document, it is next to impossible to separate the wheat from the chaff. The influence of Diogenes Laertius seems to make a critical examination of the product of his labors imperative, but the result of such an examination seems to imply that an authentic history of Greek philosophy cannot be written. As a source book of biographical and doxographical items concerning the classic philosophers of Greece, the compilation of Diogenes Laertius cannot, in view of his methods, be regarded with much seriousness.

A Mine of Quotations From Lost Works

The problem. — Little more reliance can be placed on the express references of Diogenes Laertius to his numerous secondary sources. A critical examination of the nature of his references to the "long procession of respectable authorities whom he punctiliously parades at every turn"[9]

[9] Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius,* ix.

reveals the author to have been just as uncritical and unreliable in his use of his alleged authorities as he was in his presentation of the subjects of his biographies. This may be borne out by a brief review of some of the most striking results which have been obtained by such an examination so far as those results have an immediate bearing on the interpretation of the book.

The nature of the references. — The agreements and disagreements of the authors cited by Diogenes Laertius at the points where he has multiplied his references do not concern the interpretations of important ideas or of the implications or influence of such ideas, but relate merely to biographical details, relations of teachers and pupils, the writings and achievements of philosophers, different versions that had originated in the telling and retelling of stories and sayings, etc. The selections made from the writings adduced by Diogenes Laertius are in many cases not characteristic of those writings or have been taken from sources which were not worthy of the reliance placed on them. Thus the only astronomical works cited for astronomical explanations are those of Posidonius; only once is a mathematical work quoted to introduce a mathematical illustration, and then for dramatic purposes only; a work on education is authority for the invention of the shoulder pad for porters; the main historian referred to by Diogenes Laertius is the Sophist Favorinus; comic poets are drawn upon for biographical data and philosophical opinions; epitomes are resorted to for doctrinal accounts; the most important source for chronological data was an iambic poem by Apollodorus, the inaccuracies and ambiguities of which combined with later misinterpretations and rearrangements in tabular form to make the chronological record unreliable; etc. Writings belonging to different fields of inquiry were again and again treated as of equal authority as long as they offered com-

ments of interest to the compiler. Thus Euripides, Callimachus, Timon, Theophrastus, Parmenides, historians, and astronomers were equally good authorities on astronomy; Pamphila, Callimachus, a book on Alexander, and a mathematical work were equally appropriate mathematical sources; Aristoxenus the musician and purveyor of scandals, comic poets, Myronianus, and Plato in his dialogues spoke with equal reliability on the personal appearance of the philosophers; little discrimination was made between the types of writers who mentioned, praised, or ridiculed the eminent philosophers; etc. Frequently only certain statements included in more or less extended passages are attributed by Diogenes Laertius to specific authors; often he alluded to unnamed sources (" some," " others," " they ") ; and it may be determined statistically that the uncredited notes outnumber the references for which credit is given within the various rubrics of his compilation.

The unsatisfactoriness of the compilation. — From such considerations it appears that no conclusions may safely be drawn concerning particular writings which Diogenes Laertius may have read at first hand and that any use made of the references in Diogenes Laertius for a partial reconstruction of the works from which they have been taken must be made with a consciousness of the distortions that were involved in the manner in which the references were collected. The studies made of Diogenes Laertius by philologians have yielded valuable results,[10] but as a mine of quotations from lost works of antiquity the book has not merited the attention which it has received.

[10] Thus, e.g., light has been shed by Bahnsch on the contradictions and repetitions of Diogenes Laertius, by Egger on treatments of the philosophic successions from Aristotle to Diogenes Laertius, and by various critics on the manuscripts and the condition of the text. See also note 40 in Chapter II.

A Product of Tradition

The importance of the book. — The manifest dependence of Diogenes Laertius on the long succession of his predecessors does, however, furnish some indications, at least, of the general lines followed in the philosophic activities of the centuries preceding the composition of the Laertian compilation so far as the latter was influenced by the former. The cumulative effect of the tendencies characteristic of those activities, as viewed in retrospect, was such as to create the general atmosphere out of which the work of Diogenes Laertius was produced. When considered in this light, the work of Diogenes Laertius begins to take on real significance as occupying an important position in the history of thought. From this standpoint the compilation was an important link in the chain of the philosophic tradition, effecting the transition from the philosophies of the ancient world to the interpretations that have been fastened on those philosophies by succeeding ages.

Characteristics of the tradition. — Philosophy, as represented by the writers of the centuries before Diogenes Laertius who influenced his work, was retrospective instead of being original and forward-looking. These exponents of philosophy were Epigoni who did not aim to develop insight of their own, but lived on the funded capital of the ideas of their masters. Many writers of the period were conscious of their desire to emulate the Greeks of old. Thus philosophy tended to become traditional, antiquarian, and authoritarian.

In the hands of such as had studied the old masters, philosophy became a means of educating the masses instead of being an organized expression of experience. Its materials were rearranged from pedagogical points of view. Its students were not taught to begin with experience, but with

the doctrines that had been hallowed by time and by the reputation of the originators of those doctrines. The systems of the ancients were examined from the point of view of their outcome rather than of their origin, their solutions rather than the causes giving rise to their problems, the forms in which they had become crystallized rather than the influences which brought about changes in them. The great thinkers were treated as teachers who transmitted their teachings to their loyal disciples; their opinions were viewed as systems of doctrines expressed in propositions; their writings were examined for texts which might serve as pegs on which to hang doctrinal expositions. Methods of study and aids to memory were devised; chronological successions were put into poetic form to facilitate learning.

The dominant interests of those devoted to the teaching and the study of the ancient philosophies furnished the schemes according to which the doctrines of all philosophers could be presented in a comprehensible, rather than analyzed in a comprehensive, manner. The main interest was not in the philosophers themselves, or even in what they had said, but rather in certain selected topics on which they were made to state opinions. The consequence was a distortion of the real messages of the ancient thinkers and a tendency of the interpreters to content themselves with epitomized expositions of philosophic teachings.

The various philosophers were labeled according to their answers to the questions on which they were supposed to have spoken. The value of their doctrines was determined by the prejudices of their interpreters or by appeals to their excellence and reputation or to the character of the groups who espoused their teachings or even by the labels that had become attached to the names or doctrines of the philosophers. Thus philosophy was treated as a controversial or sectarian affair, rather than as a technique of impartial and

open-minded inquiry. Rival claims concerning the founders of rival schools led to legends concerning the rivalries between the founders themselves. The founders of the schools were looked upon as the spokesmen of the tenets of later representatives of the schools. Since the doctrines of the leaders could be fully appreciated only by their followers, the members of a school were held a select circle, and the teachings studied by them were held to be esoteric.

The output of books to satisfy the educational demands of the age determined the mode of treatment to which philosophy was subjected. Bibliographical considerations formed the channels into which philosophical speculation was confined instead of being given untrammeled freedom of movement. Titles of books and passages selected for emphasis or for memorization gave prominence to the corresponding aspects of philosophic thought. The classifications invented by librarians were carried over into the contents of the various philosophies. Literature had more adherents than science, and the words of poets were quoted with more familiarity and confidence than the findings of scientific experts. The problems of style resulting from the use of Greek by non-Greeks directed attention to the style in which the ancients had written. The interest in the subjects treated by popular writers was transferred to earlier philosophers who were supposed to have manifested a concern equal to that manifested by posterity for the rudiments of certain sciences or arts or for legal enactments or for certain superficial phases of life or especially for moral problems.

The chief aim of philosophy was conceived to be moralistic rather than intellectualistic. As a means of education philosophy had to contend with other media of instruction. Its value was judged by the effect it had on life rather than by the interpretation it gave of life, by the influence it exercised on human nature rather than by the light it shed

on nature, by the advice it offered rather than by the effectiveness with which it integrated knowledge. The various problems raised in ethical speculation were individual, not social. Especially the ideal of tranquillity of mind seized upon the imagination of the disciples of the various Greek schools. A philosopher became a moral adviser whose counsel was handed down from generation to generation or an incarnation of moral wisdom who was worshiped in the cult of the ideal wise man and whose life was studied as a model to be imitated.

Biography as well as doxography thus became associated with morals rather than with insights. The lives and the opinions of eminent philosophers were not related to each other empirically, but were treated separately, moralistically, and eulogistically. Rhetoric lent its aid to the administering of praise and blame and the expression of agreements and disagreements. The dramatizing motive was called into play in stressing the achievements of the philosophers, for the age was conscious of the spirit of invention and discovery. The interest in stories encouraged the growth of legends and the narration of myths concerning the marvels produced or experienced by the philosophers. Superstition embellished the accounts of the honors bestowed on the philosophers or the wrath of heaven visited on their foes. Deification became a common method of eulogizing both the careers and the systems of the eminent philosophers. Philosophy adopted the language of religion and undertook to perform the mission of consolation and regeneration.

The spirit of nationalism made of philosophy a handmaiden of politics and a vehicle of propaganda. The presence of barbarians was constantly in evidence, and barbarian philosophies were disparaged — or sought after — merely because they were barbarian, as Greek philosophies

were esteemed merely because they were Greek. Many were willing to acknowledge an indebtedness of the Greeks to the Orient, especially in view of the increasing orientalization of Greek religion and culture.

The reinterpretation of Greek philosophy. — The interests reflected in these various cross currents of ideas were read back by the writers of the age into the philosophies of the preceding age. Incapable of producing philosophies of their own, the exponents of philosophy sought solutions for their problems in the past. The nature of their own problems was indicated indirectly in the way in which they adapted the classic philosophies of Greece to their own needs. Such was the tradition in which authors with a mere collecting and cataloguing interest were caught up and which accounts for many of the divergences between the writings of a Plato and an Aristotle and the accounts of them given by a Diogenes Laertius.

A Reflection of the Original Audience

The choice of materials. — That the selection of materials for the book of Diogenes Laertius was determined in the last analysis by the interests of his readers the author himself expressly indicated when he excluded a detailed exposition of Plato's doctrines as unnecessary, confined his materials on Stoicism to the scope considered proper for an introductory handbook, and allowed Epicurus to speak for himself in order to facilitate a comprehensive and independent judgment of the founder of the Epicurean school.[11] But a fair conception of the type of audience for which the book was written may best be gained by a consideration of some of the more outstanding general features of the book.

[11] III 47 VII 48, 160 X 29.

The circle of readers. — The circle of readers to whom Diogenes Laertius made his appeal seems to have been a group of near-intellectuals in an age of decline. They had come from or were still engaged in various occupations: included in their number were poets, dramatists, artists, musicians, politicians, soldiers, lawyers, orators, grammarians, physicians, mathematicians, astronomers, merchants, athletes, tavern-keepers, etc. Many of them had gained considerable wealth and had found their way into, or gained influence with, the nobility.

Their main interests were social. Eating, drinking, and lovemaking absorbed most of their attention. They cultivated the friendship of the great and the near-great and within their own circle fostered an atmosphere of easy familiarity. Their personal appearance, the clothing they wore, the quality of their voice, and the unguents with which they anointed themselves were sources of satisfaction to them. They were fond of luxury and display and enjoyed the Oriental rarities that had begun to play an important part in their lives. Vice and superstition flourished in their world, and in consequence of the inferior state of medical practice they were subject to diseases of various kinds. But outdoor life, exercise, and the interest in games helped to counteract, in a measure, their susceptibility to disease and pestilence.

Besides poetry, drama, and art, public benefactions, military revolutions, and Oriental mysteries were among the topics of the day. The ability to make apt quotations, to tell a good story, and to engage in repartee were achievements whose attainment they coveted. Philosophers being as common in their society as ecclesiastics in the Middle Ages, a knowledge of the lives and opinions of the leading philosophers enabled the members of the various groups striving for culture to take an effective part in the gossip of the intelli-

gentsia of the time. The study of the example and precepts of the philosophers was popular also because such a study furthered the cultivation of one's personality, which was essential to the possession of social charm. Philosophy was viewed therefore as a way of life; to those who had embraced it as a substitute for religion it offered a means of deliverance from individual and social ills; and in the hands of a socially-minded group of dilettantes philosophy sank to the level of a collection of gossipy anecdotes and of copy-book maxims. The learning of philosophic doctrines was made easy by their exposition according to a preconceived scheme, and the form of presentation was emphasized to cover the barrenness of the content.

The true nature of the book. — That such a book as this should have come to wield a more determining influence on the manner of the writing of histories of philosophy than almost any other book is one of the anomalies of history. The real significance of the work is easily obscured when it is read in the light of the claim made for it in its traditional title, but a comprehensive analysis of the contents of the book and a thoughtful consideration of the indications given in the document itself of the circumstances under which it was written strongly suggest that the chief value of the compilation lay in the service which it rendered to its first readers as a primer of instruction or as a moral handbook and a manual of social charm.

A Revelation of the Traits of the Author

His expressions of his own opinions. — To some of his own views Diogenes Laertius gave direct expression in a number of his epigrams and in a few other passages in his book. The former were chiefly moral admonitions and tributes of praise, and the latter included a commendation of Platonism and of

the Epicurean ideal of happiness, an expression of the superiority of poets over prose-writers, and questions of fact concerning several ancient philosophers.[12] Apart from such direct statements of his views the author has revealed some of his characteristic traits in his style, in the arrangement of his book, in his main emphases, in the exposition of his plan, and in his doctrinal categories.

Indications of his main motives. — The style is that of a diligent collector of notes carelessly thrown together. The main books are devoted to Plato and to Epicurus, the author manifesting throughout the other books a great interest in the former. The system of the Stoics is presented with comparative comprehensiveness as is the account of the controversy between the dogmatists and the Skeptics. The sages with their precepts receive more attention than the early cosmologists. The Cynics are treated as forerunners of the Stoics, and the Sporadics are associated with the Pythagoreans in the Italian line of succession. Comparatively little attention is given to the Peripatetics. The body of knowledge presented by the Peripatetics and the early cosmologists would not have been understood. The appeal is not to knowledge except in the form of memorized outlines and dogmas, but to individual conduct, entertaining gossip, and the administering of praise and blame. Among the principal opponents of philosophers were the rhetoricians, and philosophic dogmas were to be preserved from the reinterpretations coming in through contact with Oriental cults.

Philosophers were presented in the most favorable light. Their activities resulted in moral benefits to individuals and in the promotion of civic betterment. Evil tyrants were deposed through the influence of the philosophers, but good rulers had no better friends or more loyal supporters than

[12] See Chapter IV, notes 94–109, and Chapter III, notes 189–191.

the philosophers. Philosophers ought therefore to be most highly esteemed in society and deserve to be patronized by those in power.

The keynote of the book is struck at the very outset. Some of the main motives of the author may be traced even in the prologue. All relations between barbarian thought and Greek philosophy are repudiated in the opening sentences of the book, though the teachings of the Egyptians and of the Magi are briefly outlined — it may be because of the Alexandrian and Persian influences on the Greeks and Romans in the days of Diogenes Laertius. Philosophy is distinguished from the mere profession of wisdom and from religion. Philosophy, like everything worthwhile, began and ended with the Greeks. The philosophy of the Greeks is divided into an Ionian and an Italian branch, the latter referring to the philosophic activities in what was known as "Magna Graecia." The manner of biographical treatment is foreshadowed in the story of the conversation of Pythagoras with the tyrant Leon and in the accounts of the deaths of Musaeus, Linus, and Orpheus, and the manner of presenting the opinions of the philosophers is foreshadowed in the brief account of the teachings of Potamo, the founder of the Eclectic school.

Throughout the biographies there is a straining after the novel and unusual. As regards philosophic doctrine, dialectic had little appeal to Diogenes Laertius beyond its relation to grammar, a number of classifications, and the stories of famous arguments by means of which philosophers were victorious over their respective opponents. The usefulness of dialectic was open to serious questioning, especially in view of its tendency to become eristic. Nor did the sciences of astronomy, mathematics, and medicine elicit any interest in Diogenes save for his concern about their place in an educational scheme and the evidence of their

difficulty in the achievements made in these fields by the gifted philosophers. Physics was subordinated to ethics as in the Stoic doctrine of " life in agreement with nature." The questions asked about the universe had to do mainly with the applicability to it of such adjectives as one or many, limited or unlimited, etc., and with explanations of certain natural phenomena. Among living creatures man was the foremost, and the most important problem in the realm of physics was the nature of the soul. Human life in its various phases and typical follies of men were among the principal topics discussed in the sayings of the philosophers. In politics the supreme question was the part to be played in it by the wise man and his behavior as a good politician. In ethics the nature of the " end " was to be determined, the way to the achievement of happiness was to be outlined, and virtue was to be made teachable. The Laertian instruction in philosophic doctrine, viewed as a whole, was such as might well have been given to groups meeting at intervals for social fellowship, popular lectures, and friendly discussions.

His successes and his failures. — That the book of Diogenes Laertius met with favor at the hands of the readers for whom it was primarily intended need not be doubted. The author was a shrewd and enterprising man of the world who knew his audience well and unquestionably succeeded in adapting his material to their intellectual *niveau* and in providing the type of entertainment and mental stimulus they demanded. Whether the Platonist lady whom Diogenes endeavored to interest in Plato was a noble or royal patroness of the author, whether the work in its original form was preceded by a formal dedication to this lady, whether the literary venture of Diogenes won her approval, and whether she actually sponsored his work, we have no means of knowing. It may be supposed, however,

that the repeated emphasis of the author on dedications of books and on examples of royal support given to the writings of philosophers [13] reflected the desire of Diogenes Laertius for her patronage and his willingness to indite the proper dedication if that patronage were forthcoming.

On the other hand, in the professed endeavor to give a trustworthy account of the careers and the doctrinal systems of the outstanding classic philosophers of Greece, the book was a lamentable failure. Nor did the author succeed in staying the increasing popular interest in Oriental mysticism and in preserving the heritage of classic antiquity in its supposed pristine purity. Sopater, who is reported to have made extracts from the book and who may have used the document for the kind of propaganda which Diogenes Laertius would have approved, had to pay with his life for his activities in behalf of paganism under the Emperor Constantine. The influence of the methodology of Diogenes Laertius on modern philosophical historiography is due to the use that has been made of his book as a source book in Greek philosophy rather than as an expression of the interests of the author and of his readers.

Whatever interpretations may be given of the nature and significance of the book of Diogenes Laertius must, however, in the present state of knowledge concerning the book and its author, be offered in a tentative manner. When the history of the text is better known, when the date and place of the composition of the work have been more definitely fixed, when this ancient document has been thoroughly compared with other writings of the period, and when the more general problems raised by the outstanding characteristics of the work have been solved, the conclusions which at the present time appear to be justified, in view of the analysis

[13] See especially IV 38.

made of the book, will be placed in their proper setting. While the Laertian compilation gives illuminating answers to many questions, in some respects the *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers* has nevertheless, even to the present day, remained a mystery.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions of Diogenes Laertius

De Vita et Moribus Philosophorum. Octauianus, Venetiis, 1490.

Vitae et Sententiae Philosophorum. Ragazoni, Bologna, 1495.

De Uitis, Decretis, et Responsis Celebrium Philosophorum Libri Decem, Nunc Primum Excusi. Greek and Latin. Frobenius, Basileae, 1533.

Le Vite de gli Illustri Filosofi. Tr. by Bartolommeo, Ludovico, and Pietro Rosettini. Vaugrès, Vienegia, 1545.

Apophthegmata Graeca Regum et Ducum, Philosophorum Item, Aliorumque Quorundam, ex Plutarcho et Diogene Laertio. Stephanus, Geneva, 1568.

De Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Clarorum Philosophorum Libri Decem. Graece et Latine. Stephanus, Geneva, 1594.

De Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Clarorum Philosophorum Libri Decem. Graece et Latine. Ed. by Marcus Meibomius. Wetstein, Amsterdam, 1692.

De Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Clarorum Philosophorum Libri Decem. Graece et Latine. Ed. by Longolius. Chur, Püttner, 1739.

Les Vies des plus illustres philosophes de l'antiquité, avec leurs dogmes, leurs systèmes, leur morale et leurs sentences les plus remarquables. Schneider, Amsterdam, 1758.

De Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Clarorum Philosophorum Libri Decem. Graece et Latine. Kraus, Leipsic, 1759.

De Vitis, Dogmatis et Apophthegmatis Clarorum Philosophorum. Ed. by H. G. Huebner. Koehler, Leipsic, 1828.

Diogène de Laerte, vies et doctrines des philosophes de l'antiquité. Tr. by M. Zevort. Charpentier, Paris, 1847.

De Clarorum Philosophorum Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Libri Decem. Ed. by C. G. Cobet. Graece et Latine. Didot, Paris, 1850.

The Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers. Tr. by C. D. Yonge. Bohn, London, 1853.

De Vitis Philosophorum Libri Decem. Ed. stereotypa C. Tauchnitii. Holtze, Leipsic, 1895.

Diogenis Laertii Vita Platonis. Recensebant Hermannus Breitenbach, Fridericus Buddenhagen, Albertus Debrunner, Fridericus Von der Muehll. Sonderabdruck aus *Juvenes Dum Sumus.* Helbing und Lichtenhahn, Basel, 1907.

Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs. Tr. of Book X by A. Kochalsky. Teubner, Leipsic, 1914.

Epicuro. Opere, Frammenti, Testimonianze sulla sua Vita. Tr. by E. Bignone. Laterza e Figli, Bari, 1920.

Epicuri Epistulae Tres et Ratae Sententiae a Laertio Diogene Servatae. Ed. by P. Von der Muehll. Teubner, Leipsic, 1922.

La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce. Ed. by A. Delatte. Lamertin, Bruxelles, 1922.

Lives of Eminent Philosophers. Greek and English. Tr. by R. D. Hicks. Heinemann, London, 1925.

Literature on Diogenes Laertius

Arnim, Ioannes ab, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta.* Leipsic, 1905. Vol. I, pp. xxx-xliii: "De Diogene Laërtio et Ario Didymo."

Bahnsch, Fridericus, *Quaestionum de Diogenis Laertii Fontibus Initia.* Koenigsberg, 1868. 56 pp.

Bonnet, M., "Die Pariser Handschriften des Laertius Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXXII (1877), 578–90.

Brucker, Jakob, *Erste Anfangsgründe der Philosophischen Geschichte.* 2te Ausgabe (Auszug). Ulm, 1751.

Bruckerus, Iacobus, *Institutiones Historiae Philosophicae.* 3d ed. Leipsic, 1790.

Bruns, G., "Die Testamente der Griechen," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* I (1880), 1–52.

Burnet, John, *Early Greek Thinkers.* 3d ed. London, 1920. 361 pp.

Christ, Wilhelm von, *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur.* In: Müller, Iwan von, *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* 5th ed. München, 1913.

Cobet, C. G., "Variae Lectiones," in *Mnemosyne,* VII (1858), 52–55.

——— *Variae Lectiones.* 2d ed. Leyden, 1873, pp. 320, 322.

——— "Ad Diogenem Laertium," in *Mnemosyne,* N. S. IV (1876), 196.

——— *Collectanea Critica.* Leyden, 1878. Pages 449–60: "Diogenis Laertii Vita Pythagorae."

Coss, John J., "Francis Bacon and the History of Philosophy," in *Studies in the History of Ideas* [Columbia University]. New York, 1918, Vol. I, pp. 80–87.

Covotti, Aurelio, "Quibus Libris Vitarum in Libro Septimo Laertius Usus Fuerit," in *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica,* V (1897), 65–97.

Crönert, Wilhelm, *Kolotes und Menedemos.* Leipsic, 1906. Pages 133–47: "Sätze zur Quellenkunde des Diogenes."

Czebe, Julius, "Zu Diogenes Laertius III 28 und Alkiphron IV 7," in *Philologus,* LXXV (1919), 178–82.

Diels, H., "Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronika," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXI (1876), 1–54.

——— *Doxographi Graeci.* Berlin, 1879, pp. 161–68.

——— "Reiskii Animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem," in *Hermes,* XXIV (1889), 302–25.

——— "Ein gefälschtes Pythagorasbuch," in *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie,* III (1890), 451–72.

Drerup, E., "Edgar Martini, Analecta Laertiana," in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift,* XIX (1899), 1475–78.

Düntzer, Heinrich, "Bemerkungen zum sogenannten Caecilius Balbus," in *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik,* LXXI (1855), 654–61.

Egger, Victor, *De Fontibus Diogenis Laertii.* Bordeaux, 1881. 77 pp.

Freudenthal, J., *Hellenistische Studien,* Heft 3: "Der Platoniker Albinos und der falsche Alkinoos." Berlin, 1879. Pages 304–15: "Zur Quellenkunde des Laertius Diogenes."

Gabrielsson, Johannes, *Über Favorinus und Seine* Παντοδαπὴ Ἱστορία. Upsala, 1906. 67 pp.

Gassendi, Pierre, *Animadversiones in Decimum Librum Diogenis Laertii.* 3 vols. Leyden, 1649.

Geffcken, Johannes, *Kaiser Julianus.* Leipsic, 1914, pp. 156, 157.

Gercke, Alfred, *De Quibusdam Laertii Diogenis Auctoribus.* Greifswald, 1899.

——— "Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik," in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Litteratur,* VII (1901), 213.

——— "Die Überlieferung des Diogenes Laertius," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 401–34.

——— "Griechische Litteratur," in Bursian's *Jahresbericht,* CXXIV (1905), 528, 529.

——— "Edgar Martini, Analecta Laertiana," in *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung,* XXI (1900), 170–73.

Gutschmid, Alfred von, "De Aegyptiacis apud Diogenem Laertium Eorumque Fontibus," in *Kleine Schriften,* I, 184–200. Leipsic, 1889.

Hall, F. W., *Companion to Classical Texts.* Oxford, 1913, p. 232.

Heine, O., "Kritische Beiträge zum Siebenten Buche des Laertios Diogenes," in *Jahrbuch für Classische Philologie,* XCIX (1869), 611–28.

Hiller, E., "Die Litterarische Tätigkeit der Sieben Weisen," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXXIII (1878), 518–29.

Hopfner, Theodor, *Orient und Griechische Philosophie.* (*Beihefte zum alten Orient,* Heft 4.) Leipsic, 1925. 89 pp.

Howald, E., "Handbücher als Quellen des Diogenes Laertius," in *Philologus,* LXXIV (1917), 119–30.

——— "Das Philosophiegeschichtliche Kompendium des Areios Didymos," in *Hermes,* LV (1920), 68–98.

——— "Die Schriftenverzeichnisse des Aristoteles und des Theophrast," in *Hermes,* LV (1920), 204–21.

Huebner, H. G., *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium.* Isaaci Casauboni Notae atque Aegidii Menagii Observationes et Emendationes in Diogenem Laertium. 2 vols. Leipsic, 1830.

Jacoby, Felix, "Apollodors Chronik," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* XVI (1902), 1–416.

Jahn, Otto, "Variorum Lectionum Fasciculus," in *Philologus,* XXVI (1867), 4.

——— "Variorum Lectionum Fasciculus Alter," in *Philologus,* XXVIII (1869), 4.

Lambros, S. P., Ἀνέκδοτα ἀπανθίσματα Διογένους τοῦ Λαερτίου. In *Mélanges Nicole,* 639–51. Geneva, 1905.

Leo, F., *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach Ihrer Litterarischen Form.* Leipsic, 1901, pp. 35–84.

Lortzing, Franz, "Volckmann," in Bursian's *Jahresbericht,* XCVI (1898), 185–87.

Maass, Ernestus, "De Biographis Graecis Quaestiones Selectae," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* III (1880), 1–141.

Madvig, I. N., *Adversaria Critica.* Copenhagen, 1871, Vol. I, pp. 712–16.

Marres, J. L., *Dissertatio de Favorini Arelatensis Vita, Studiis, Scriptis.* Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1853. x, 145 pp.

Martini, Edgar, "Analecta Laertiana," in *Leipziger Studien,* XIX (1899), 69–177.

——— "Analecta Laertiana, II," in *Leipziger Studien,* XX (1900), 147–66.

——— "Zur Handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Laertios Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* LV (1900), 612–24.

Mayor, John E. B., "Notes on Diogenes Laertius," in *Journal of Philology,* XXIX (1904), 1–23.

Mommsen, Theodor, "Sallustius=Salutius und das Signum," in *Hermes,* XXXVII (1902), 443–55.

Mutschmann, Herman, *Divisiones Quae Vulgo Dicuntur Aristoteleae.* Leipsic, 1906. xlii, 76 pp.

——— "Vergessenes und Übersehenes," in *Berliner Philologisches Wochenblatt,* XXVIII (1908), 1328.

Nietzsche, F., "De Laertii Diogenis Fontibus, I," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIII (1868), 632–53.

——— "De Laertii Diogenis Fontibus, II," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIV (1869), 181–228.

——— "Analecta Laertiana," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXV (1870), 217–31.

——— "Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Kritik des Diogenes Laertius," in *Nietzsches Werke,* XVII, 3, I, 171–214. Leipsic, 1910.

Richards, Herbert, "Laertiana," in *Classical Review,* XVIII (1904), 340–46.

Ritschl, Fr., and Usener, H., "Stichometrisches bei Diogenes Laertius," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XIII (1858), 309–15.

Ritter, C., "Platonica," in *Philologus,* LXVIII (1909), 334–36.

Roeper, Gottlieb, "Emendationes," in *Philologus,* I (1846), 652–63.

——— "Korrekturen zu Diogenes Laertius," in *Philologus,* III (1848), 22–65.

——— "Korrekturen zu Diogenes Laertius," in *Philologus,* IX (1854), 1–42.

——— "Zu Laertios Diogenes," in *Philologus,* XXX (1870), 557–77.

Rose, Valentinus, *De Aristotelis Librorum Ordine et Auctoritate.* Berlin, 1854. 30 pp.

——— "Die Lücke im Diogenes Laertius und der alte Übersetzer," in *Hermes,* I (1866), 367–97.

Rossius, Ignatius, *Commentationes Laertianae.* Rome, 1788. lix, 347 pp.

Rudolph, Felix, "De Fauorino Diogenis Laertii Auctore," in *Leipziger Studien,* VII (1884), 126–34.

Schaefer, Friedrich, *Quid Graeci de Origine Philosophiae a Barbaris Ducenda Existimaverint.* Leipsic, 1877. iv, 50 pp.

Scheurleer, G. A., *Disputatio Philologica de Demetrio Magnete.* Leyden, 1858. 128 pp.

Schmidt, Hans, *Studia Laertiana.* Bonn, 1906. 43 pp.

Schneider, J. G., "Diogenes Laertius und der Engländer Burley," in Wolf's *Literarische Analekten,* III (1818), 227–55.

Schwartz, E., "Diogenes Laertius," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart, 1903, Vol. IX, pp. 738–75.

Stahr, Adolph, "Diogenes Laertius," in Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.* London, 1876, Vol. I, pp. 1022, 1023.

Strachey, J. St. Loe, "Shirtsleeve Portraits of Greek Philosophers," in *New York Times,* April 4, 1926, Section 3, pp. 7, 23.

Susemihl, Franz, "Zu Diogenes Laertius," in *Philologus,* XXX (1870), 568.

——— "Zu Diogenes Laertius," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXVI (1871), 336–41.

——— "Zu den Biographien des Bion und des Pittakus bei Laertius Diogenes," in *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie,* XXXVI (1890), 187–91.

——— *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit.* 2 vols. Leipsic, 1891.

Trevissoi, M., "Diogene Laerzio, L'età in cui visse," in *Rivista di Storia Antica,* N. S. XII (1909), 482–505.

Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie.* Vol. I: "Die Philosophie des Altertums." Ed. by K. Praechter. 12th ed. Berlin, 1926.

Usener, H., *Analecta Theophrastea.* Leipsic, 1858. 48 pp.

——— *Epicurea.* Leipsic, 1887.

——— *Die Unterlage des Diogenes Laertius.* Berlin, 1892.

——— "Unser Platontext," in *Göttinger Nachrichten,* 1892, pp. 209–12.

Wachsmuth, C., "Ein verschollener (?) Codex des Laertius Diogenes," in *Rheinisches Museum,* N. F. XXIX (1874), 354, 355.

——— *Sillographorum Graecorum Reliquiae.* Leipsic, 1885, pp. 51–55.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v., "Epistola ad Maassium," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* III (1880), 142–64.

——— "Antigonus von Karystos," in *Philologische Untersuchungen,* IV (1881), 1–336.

——— "Lesefrüchte," in *Hermes,* XXXIV (1899), 632.

Woodbridge, F. J. E., "Philosophy," in *Greek Literature* (A Series of Lectures Delivered at Columbia University). New York, 1912, pp. 209–28.

INDEX

Many of the names and subjects listed below have been selected for their importance in the book of Diogenes Laertius. Pertinent references to Diogenes Laertius are given in the footnotes on the respective pages indicated below.

Academics, 44, 51, 61, 66, 80, 103, 122, 126, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 141, 143, 198. *See also* Academy, Plato, Platonism

Academy, 64, 71, 75, 133, 134, 135, 139, 148. *See also* Academics, Plato, Platonism

Achievements of philosophers, 62, 63, 166, 167, 168, 185, 187, 188, 194, 201, 209, 214, 216, 220. *See also* Fame, "First" achievements of philosophers; "Floruit"; Military achievements, Predictions, of philosophers

Advice of philosophers, 72, 155, 173, 214. *See also* Sayings of philosophers

Age of philosophers, 56, 69, 78, 89, 91, 162, 163, 164, 166, 168. *See also* Chronology, Deaths of philosophers

Aldobrandinus, Thomas, 24, 28. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius

Alexander Polyhistor, 46, 47, 50, 51, 71, 83

Alexandrians, 46, 47, 51, 53, 66, 96, 109, 125, 219. *See also* Grammarians

Ambrosius Traversarius Camalduensis, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 42. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius

Ancestors of philosophers, 62, 74, 75, 146, 167, 168. *See also* Descent, Fathers, Parents, of philosophers

Anthologies. *See* Palatine Anthology, Planudean Anthology

Antigonus of Carystus, 44, 54, 70

Apollodorus, 54, 65–70, 75, 85, 89, 91, 209. *See also* Chronology

Apollonius of Tyre, 18, 44, 76

Areios Didymus, 57

Aristippus, 12, 25, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 81, 85, 89, 90, 93, 104, 113–15, 132, 138, 144, 151, 153, 158, 163, 176, 180, 189, 198, 205

Aristippus, Henricus, 11, 12, 30

Aristotle, 12, 23, 27, 46, 47, 52, 58, 61, 72–84, 90, 91, 95, 96, 104, 105, 116, 124, 128, 130, 131, 134, 141–48, 155, 158, 172, 174–201, 210, 215, 218. *See also* Peripatetics

Aristoxenus, 44, 46, 52–54, 64, 73–76, 83, 90, 96, 152, 210

Arnim, Ioannes ab, 28, 34, 54, 55

Arria, 6, 7

Art, 109, 111, 112, 156, 200, 213, 216. *See also* Music, Painting, Statues of philosophers

Astronomy, 60, 63, 65, 73, 75, 87,

108, 115, 120, 125, 157, 166, 171, 182, 184–87, 200, 208, 210, 216, 219
Athenaeus, 8, 48, 80
Athens, 66, 119, 147, 159. *See also* Places
Athletes, 74, 119. *See also* Gymnastics

Bahnsch, F., 39, 40, 54, 210
Barbarians, 93, 95, 109, 110, 114, 119, 133, 157, 173, 182, 185, 214–19, 221. *See also* Egyptians, Greeks
Basle edition of Diogenes Laertius, 13, 20, 21, 27. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius, Von der Muehll, F.
Biography, 31, 35, 42, 43, 46, 48, 52–54, 58, 60, 62–66, 70, 71, 88, 89, 91, 125, 143, 144–68, 169, 170, 208, 209, 213, 214, 219, 221
Bion, 51, 85, 93, 102, 103, 132, 133, 136, 142, 146, 153, 158, 174, 184, 189
Birth of philosophers, 62, 65, 68, 71, 74, 146, 167, 168. *See also* Ancestors, Birthplaces, Descent, Fathers, Parents, of philosophers
Birthplaces of philosophers, 62, 63, 64, 71, 75. *See also* Birth of philosophers, Places, Travels of philosophers
Bonnet, M., 13, 15, 18
Books, 70, 72, 82, 108, 117, 124–26, 129, 149, 152, 160, 161, 213. *See also* Dedications of books, Epitomes, "Mention" of philosophers in books, Writings of philosophers
Burial of philosophers, 130, 154, 159, 163, 164. *See also* Deaths, Tombs, of philosophers
Burleigh, Walter, 11, 12
Burnet, J., 145, 207
Bywater, I., 14, 16, 27, 28

Callimachus, 46, 54, 63, 73, 78, 81, 210. *See also* Alexandrians
Casaubon, I. and M., 7, 23, 24, 140
Character of philosophers, 103, 128, 167. *See also* Personal characteristics of philosophers
Children of philosophers, 76, 151, 205. *See also* Marriage of philosophers
Christ, Wilhelm von, 5, 7, 10, 52
Chronology, 53, 54, 60, 63, 65–70, 89, 91, 144, 163, 165, 168, 209, 212. *See also* Age of philosophers, Apollodorus, Diels, H., "Floruit," Jacoby, F., Synchronisms
Chrysippus, 55, 56, 79, 82, 90, 93, 100, 114, 119, 124–28, 132, 133, 136, 139, 150, 189–97
Clement of Alexandria, 8, 51, 110
Clothing of philosophers, 76, 206, 216. *See also* Personal characteristics of philosophers
Cobet, C. G., 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, 29, 145, 166. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius, Manuscripts of the book of Diogenes Laertius
Comic poets, 46, 63, 64, 76, 81, 83, 84, 91, 117, 125, 209, 210. *See also* Drama, Meineke, A., Poets
Commentaries on Diogenes Laertius, 24, 26

Constantine, 6, 10, 221
Controversies in philosophy, 72, 77, 78, 80, 83, 88, 101, 106–8, 119, 123, 125, 128, 129, 186, 189–92, 195, 196, 205, 212, 213
Conversion of philosophers, 102–5
Crönert, W., 7, 56, 57
Customs, ancient, 63, 70, 76, 101, 108, 109, 111, 188
Cynics, 8, 30, 89, 91, 70, 71, 76, 101, 104, 105, 116, 133, 135–39, 142, 146, 148, 176, 181, 188, 189, 192, 195, 198–201, 218
Cyrenaics, 72, 83, 86, 102–4, 135, 137, 138, 143, 153, 158, 180, 184, 188–91, 193, 194, 199, 200

Deaths of philosophers, 53, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 78, 89, 118, 130, 160, 162–68, 170, 219. *See also* Age, Burial, of philosophers
Dedications of books, 6, 22, 24, 126, 160, 161, 221. *See also* Books, Writings of philosophers
Definitions, 73, 84, 170, 172, 176, 181, 187, 188, 189, 191, 193, 197, 207. *See also* Dialectic
Deification, 74, 122, 128, 183, 185, 214. *See also* Honors bestowed on philosophers, Religion
Delatte, A., 8, 10, 13, 16, 21, 27, 31, 38, 48, 58, 141, 142. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Demetrius of Magnesia, 38, 42, 44, 58, 66, 71, 76, 77, 79, 81, 86, 89, 130. *See also* Namesakes of philosophers
Democritus, 10, 68, 80, 94, 96, 103, 108, 112, 117, 122, 128, 130, 136, 144, 148, 154, 158, 177–79, 181, 182, 184–87, 189, 190, 194, 198
Demosthenes, 92. *See also* Rhetoric
Descent of philosophers, 65, 70, 108. *See also* Ancestors of philosophers
Dialectic, 73, 75, 84, 95, 114, 120, 125, 134, 135, 172, 176, 188, 193–97, 199, 200, 219. *See also* Definitions, Grammar, Rhetoric
Diels, H., 13, 14, 19, 28, 29, 37, 41, 42, 54, 65–70, 141, 207
Diocles, 39–45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 71, 73, 76, 77, 82, 84, 85, 88, 90, 141, 166
Diogenes Laertius, 1–36, 39, 43, 44, 54, 105, 108, 118, 123, 131, 133, 138, 139–43, 144, 145, 165–68, 184, 189, 193, 198–202, 203–22. *See also* Commentaries on Diogenes Laertius, Editions of Diogenes Laertius, Rubrics of Diogenes Laertius
Diogenes the Cynic, 25, 65, 78, 82, 91, 101, 103–5, 107, 112, 113, 116, 136, 144–48, 150, 152, 153, 155, 171, 173–75, 179, 182–84, 189, 190, 193, 194, 196
Discoveries of philosophers, 65, 214. *See also* Inventions of philosophers
Diseases of philosophers, 65, 74, 87, 118, 164, 182, 183, 216. *See also* Physicians
Doctrines, philosophic, 31, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51, 54, 58, 60, 62, 63, 71, 72, 83, 86, 88,

90, 91, 101, 103, 105–8, 116, 119, 121, 123, 128, 129, 131, 142, 143, 146, 151–53, 155, 163, 165, 166, 169–71, 174–202, 205–9, 211–14, 215, 217–21. *See also* Astronomy, Dialectic, Epitomes, Esoteric doctrines, Ethics, Mathematics, Physics, Politics, Religion, Rhetoric
Drama, 53, 60, 91, 111, 121, 125, 206, 209, 214, 216. *See also* Comic poets, Poets

Electicism, 5, 6, 40, 134, 142, 200, 211–14, 219
Editions of Diogenes Laertius, 21–29, 30, 45, 60; *editio princeps,* 17, 22, 24, 26, 28; titles of book, 32
Education, 60, 65, 74, 75, 76, 86, 98–102, 162, 170, 172, 173, 200, 205, 206, 209, 219, 220. *See also* Pupils, Schools, Teachers, of philosophers
Egger, V., 3, 45–47, 210
Egyptians, 50, 72, 109, 157, 178, 179, 182–88, 219. *See also* Barbarians
Eminence of philosophers, *see* Eulogies, Fame, of philosophers
Epictetus, 5, 54, 91, 92
Epicureanism, 42, 71, 72, 110, 140, 141, 215, 217
Epicureans, 3, 39, 45, 46, 47, 71, 72, 83, 84, 90, 101, 104, 105, 139, 141, 150, 175–77, 180, 190, 193, 200, 201
Epicurus, 24, 25, 27, 30, 41, 49, 54, 71, 72, 76, 77, 80, 82, 90, 92, 101, 102, 104, 105, 108, 110, 116, 117, 121, 122, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132, 134, 137, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 148, 154, 159, 171, 173, 175–89, 193–201, 215, 218
Epigrams on philosophers, 10, 11, 22, 30, 31, 79, 111, 140, 141, 142, 163, 164–67, 168, 184, 217
Epitomes, 46, 47, 56, 106, 129, 209, 212, 217, 218. *See also* Books, Doctrines
Esoteric doctrines, 65, 91, 99, 121, 213. *See also* Doctrines
Ethics, 46, 72, 75, 84, 101, 102–5, 119, 120, 121, 125, 129, 134, 135, 137, 149, 154, 160, 161, 163, 167, 168, 169, 170, 172, 176, 177, 179, 180, 182, 188–93, 194, 198–201, 213, 214, 217, 218, 220. *See also* Doctrines, Friendship, Politics
Eulogies of philosophers, 52, 83, 112–15, 116–22, 124, 139, 140, 143, 144, 160, 162, 164, 166, 168, 169, 176, 177, 188, 189, 193, 194, 195, 201, 212, 214, 217. *See also* Deification; Fame of philosophers; Honors bestowed on philosophers; Praise, Statues, of philosophers
Eunapius, 8, 10, 15
Euripides, 73, 74, 78, 81, 83, 87, 90, 147, 159, 174, 186, 210
Eustathius, 7, 9, 10, 30
Exiles of philosophers, 65, 70, 159. *See also* Trials of philosophers

Fabricius, 2, 5, 7, 25, 28
Fame of philosophers, 62, 63, 100, 111, 116–22, 127, 128, 137, 167, 168, 169, 195, 199, 212. *See*

also Achievements, Eulogies, of philosophers
Fathers of philosophers, 71, 75. *See also* Birth, Parents, of philosophers
Favorinus, 6, 8, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 61, 65, 73–78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 108, 166, 186, 187, 209
"First" achievements of philosophers, 64, 65, 75, 81, 87, 88, 111, 112, 118–21, 175, 177, 187, 188, 189, 194, 195, 197, 205, 206. *See also* Achievements, Discoveries, Inventions, of philosophers
"Floruit," 66, 67, 68, 69, 98. *See also* Achievements of philosophers, Chronology
Freudenthal, J., 41, 49, 54, 142, 165, 201
Friendship, 70, 72, 77, 101, 130, 143, 152–55, 159, 168, 173, 192, 216, 218
Frobenius, 2, 7, 23, 25, 96. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius

Gabrielsson, J., 56
Gale, Thomas, 16
Galen, 5, 6, 7, 8
Gassendi, P., 24, 25, 140
Gercke, A., 7, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 29, 37, 49, 54, 137, 140–42
Grammar, 56, 120, 197, 219. *See also* Alexandrians, Dialectic, Grammarians
Grammarians, 45, 53, 82, 139, 216. *See also* Alexandrians, Grammar
Greeks, 109–12, 114, 119, 129, 130, 183, 201, 211, 213, 215, 219. *See also* Barbarians
Gymnastics, 71, 77, 118, 148, 164, 216. *See also* Athletes

Hadrian, 5
Hermippus, 46, 53, 54, 57, 61, 70, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 82, 89
Hesychius, 10, 20, 23
Hicks, R. D., 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 22, 27, 60, 85, 88, 137, 145, 207. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Hiller, E., 45, 54
Hippobotus, 40, 44, 47, 49, 52, 57, 61, 72, 74, 75, 79, 82, 84, 88, 134, 135, 141
History, 46, 53, 60, 64, 65, 74, 91, 111, 125, 126, 209, 210
Homer, 8, 10, 74, 80, 90, 120, 149, 157, 171, 172, 174, 177, 182, 189
Homes of philosophers, 77, 152, 153, 216
Honors bestowed on philosophers, 64, 121, 122. *See also* Eulogies, Praise, Statues, of philosophers
Howald, E., 57, 58
Huebner, H. G., 16, 23, 26, 28, 33. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Humanists, 11, 12, 13, 30. *See also* Manuscripts of the book of Diogenes Laertius

Inventions of philosophers, 53, 56, 65, 73, 75, 96, 109, 118, 120, 185, 209, 214. *See also* Discoveries, "First" achievements, of philosophers

Jacoby, F., 54, 65–70, 85. *See also* Chronology
Jamblichus, 6, 10
Julia Domna, 7
Julian, 9, 30

Laerte, 7
Lambros, S. P., 7, 14
Laws of philosophers, 64, 72, 111, 118, 123, 130, 161, 170, 193, 213. *See also* Legislators among philosophers
Legislators among philosophers, 71, 72, 74, 77, 156, 166, 184, 216. *See also* Laws of philosophers
Leo, F., 38, 52–54, 58, 152
Letters of philosophers, 89, 111, 127–30
Lists in Diogenes Laertius, 40, 42, 43, 62, 68, 72, 77, 94, 124, 134, 135, 137, 167
Lives of philosophers, *see* Biography
Lobon, 45, 48, 54, 74, 81
Longolius, 2, 4, 7, 8, 25, 140, 141. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Lucian, 8, 108, 141. *See also* Skeptics
Lucretius, 25, 110, 122. *See also* Epicureans

Maass, E., 37, 42, 43, 44, 54, 140
Manuscripts of the book of Diogenes Laertius, 12–21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 41, 210, 221
Marriage of philosophers, 76, 128, 150, 151, 153, 168, 173. *See also* Children of philosophers
Martini, E., 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 29, 32. *See also* Manuscripts of the book of Diogenes Laertius
"Marvels," 85, 87, 121, 171, 178, 184, 214
Mathematics, 60, 65, 70, 73, 75, 87, 115, 120, 157, 186, 187, 200, 209, 210, 216, 219
Medicine, *see* Diseases of philosophers, Physicians
Meibohm, M., 24. *See also* Wetstein, H.
Meineke, A., 18, 30
Menagius, A., 2, 5, 7, 24, 25, 27, 28, 140, 141
"Mention" of philosophers in books, 79, 94, 95, 117, 204, 206, 210. *See also* Books, Writings of philosophers
Military achievements of philosophers, 71, 73, 111, 118, 125, 154, 156, 159, 173, 200, 216
Montagnone, Hieremias de, 12
Montaigne, M., 31
Muehll, Von der, *see* Von der Muehll
Music, 111, 112, 118, 149, 156, 187, 200, 216. *See also* Art
Mutschmann, H., 17, 28
Myths, 72, 145, 149, 163, 177, 182, 183, 214

Names, significance of, 6, 7, 8, 62, 63, 70, 76, 79, 98, 107, 134, 135, 147, 148, 166–68, 189–91, 194, 197, 204
Namesakes of philosophers, 42, 43, 50, 54, 64, 65, 71, 79, 86–89, 96, 99, 109, 124, 131, 132, 138, 146, 147, 149, 156, 157, 167, 168, 177, 183–85, 188, 192. *See also* Demetrius of Magnesia

Neo-Platonism, 5, 6, 8, 108
Nicias of Nicaea, 48, 49, 50, 51, 56, 88
Nietzsche, F., 37, 39–41, 42, 43, 85, 88, 141, 142, 165

Occupations of philosophers, 76, 102, 155–57, 167, 168, 216
Opinions of philosophers, *see* Doctrines, Sayings, of philosophers

Painting, 64, 83, 87, 91, 112, 156. *See also* Art
Palatine Anthology, 7, 11, 30. *See also* Planudean Anthology
Pamphila, 38, 52, 73
Parents of philosophers, 62, 75, 146, 206. *See also* Ancestors, Birth, Descent, Fathers, of philosophers
Pauly-Wissowa, *see* Schwartz, E.
Pausanias, 8, 65
Peripatetics, 46, 52, 70, 79, 108, 122, 125, 136, 139, 142, 218. *See also* Aristotle
Personal characteristics of philosophers, 53, 62, 64, 65, 70, 72, 76, 88, 91, 100, 107, 147, 148–50, 168, 210, 216. *See also* Character of philosophers
Philosophers, *see* Achievements, Advice, Age, Ancestors, of philosophers; Biography; Birth, Birthplaces, Burial, Character, Children, of philosophers; Chronology; Clothing of philosophers; Controversies in philosophy; Conversion, Deaths, Descent, Discoveries, Diseases, Doctrines, of philosophers; Education; Epigrams; Eulogies, Exiles, Fame, Fathers, of philosophers; Gymnastics; Homes of philosophers; Honors bestowed on philosophers; Inventions, Marriage, "Mention," Military achievements, Occupations, Parents, Personal characteristics, of philosophers; Places; Popularity, Poverty, Praise, Predictions, Pupils, Sayings, Schools, Sex-life, of philosophers; Slavery; Social life, Songs, Speeches, Statues, of philosophers; Stories concerning philosophers; Style, Successions, Teachers, Testaments, Tombs, Travels, Trials, Voices, Wealth, Witticisms, Writings, of philosophers, etc. *See also* Rubrics of Diogenes Laertius, etc.
Philosophy, 35, 36, 59, 60, 61, 70, 75, 79, 83, 98–115, 119, 125, 142, 144, 146, 148, 155, 159, 160, 162, 169, 170, 172, 173, 175, 176, 180, 182, 188, 192, 193, 194, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 206, 211–14, 216–19
Philosophy, history of, 1–4, 32–36, 46, 49, 58, 76, 107, 125, 133, 134, 175, 199, 203–8, 211–15, 217, 219, 221
Philostratus, 7, 8, 15, 54. *See also* Rhetoric
Photius, 9, 10, 30
Physicians, 65, 87, 100, 139, 157, 158, 182, 187, 188, 200, 216, 219. *See also* Diseases of philosophers
Physics, 47, 72, 75, 83, 119, 125,

149, 171, 172, 176–88, 193, 198–200, 220. *See also* Astronomy, Mathematics, Religion, Soul
Places, their significance to Diogenes Laertius, 68, 71, 110, 125, 129, 146, 148, 152, 153, 160, 162, 163, 165, 167, 168. *See also* Birthplaces, Exiles, Travels, of philosophers
Planudean Anthology, 11, 30. *See also* Palatine Anthology
Plato, 6, 10, 12, 17, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, 41, 44, 51, 62, 64, 70, 71–84, 92, 94–96, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, 112, 114, 116, 119, 120–49, 154–64, 169, 170, 174–99, 201, 204–7, 210, 215, 218. *See also* Academics, Academy, Platonism
Platonism, 6, 49, 60, 108, 140, 142, 143, 194, 195, 200, 207, 217, 220. *See also* Academics, Academy, Neo-Platonism, Plato
Pleasure, treatment of, in Diogenes Laertius, 72, 159, 180, 189, 190, 191, 193
Plotinus, 6, 8
Plutarch, 5, 8, 52, 54, 58, 165
Poets, 43, 53, 60, 67, 73, 81, 82, 87, 90, 91, 102, 110, 112, 125, 127, 130–33, 162, 165, 166, 170, 172, 174, 182, 209, 210, 212, 213, 216, 218. *See also* Comic Poets, Homer, Euripides
Politics, 72, 76, 77, 111, 118, 120, 125, 129, 156, 159, 161, 170, 172, 173, 176, 177, 192, 193, 200, 214, 216, 220. *See also* Ethics
Popularity of philosophers, 78, 80, 131, 213, 217, 220, 221
Porphyry, 6
Posidonius, 17, 55, 56, 65, 83, 209
Poverty of philosophers, 56, 146, 157, 158, 168. *See also* Wealth of philosophers
Praechter, K., *see* Ueberweg-Heinze
Praise of philosophers, 64, 74, 79, 114, 121, 164, 175, 210, 214, 218. *See also* Eulogies of philosophers
Predictions of philosophers, 64, 118, 122, 128, 185
Pupils of philosophers, 62, 69, 72, 80, 92, 99–101, 103, 152, 159, 170, 192, 194, 196, 198, 209, 212, 213. *See also* Education; Schools, Successions, Teachers, of philosophers
Pythagoras, 6, 65, 67, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 91, 96, 112, 114, 119, 120, 122, 123, 128, 130, 132–34, 136, 141, 142, 144, 146, 151, 152, 154, 156–59, 161, 174, 178, 179, 181–83, 185–89, 193, 194, 201
Pythagoreans, 23, 46, 50, 51, 63–65, 70, 71, 80, 83, 91, 95, 102, 114, 126, 129, 136, 141, 153, 166, 173, 175, 181, 188, 193, 199, 200, 218

Quotations, in Diogenes Laertius, 43, 82, 90, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133, 167, 181, 204–10, 213, 215, 216. *See also* Euripides, Homer, Poets, Sources

Religion, as treated by Diogenes Laertius, 60, 64, 72, 74, 87, 114, 120, 122, 125, 152, 157, 161, 164, 166, 167, 172, 175, 176, 182–84, 200, 204, 205, 214, 216, 217,

219, 221. *See also* Deification, Myths, Physics, Soul
Rhetoric, 31, 43, 46, 52, 53, 60, 64, 74, 76, 95, 107, 113–15, 120, 121, 125, 132, 139, 156, 161, 170, 196, 197, 202, 204, 205, 213, 216, 218. *See also* Demosthenes, Philostratus, Speeches of philosophers
Richards, H., 4, 28, 31
Rose, V., 3, 11, 12, 18, 38, 40
Rubrics of Diogenes Laertius, 10, 53, 56, 145, 167, 168. *See also* Diogenes Laertius

Sages, 45, 61, 70, 71, 93, 114, 115, 144, 151, 153, 157, 161, 171–73, 189, 198, 204, 205, 218, 219. *See also* Wise man
Salmasius, 11, 18
Satyrus, 53, 54, 57, 70, 74, 76, 88
Sayings of philosophers, 31, 62, 65, 71, 82, 83, 88, 90, 99–101, 151, 158, 161–63, 165, 169–74, 177, 182, 184, 187, 189–92, 198, 206, 209, 217, 219, 220. *See also* Advice, Predictions, Witticisms, of philosophers
Schmidt, H., 49, 135, 137, 140, 141
Schneider, J. H., 1, 2, 3, 11, 25, 26
Schools of philosophers, 40, 46, 48, 49, 51, 58, 63, 68, 72, 79, 86, 98–108, 116, 119, 123, 128, 130, 133–39, 144, 148, 152, 155, 167, 170, 172, 174–76, 188–90, 192, 198–200, 212–14. *See also* Education; Pupils, Successions, Teachers, of philosophers
Schwartz, E., 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 20, 27, 29, 38, 52, 54, 55, 58, 140, 141, 142
Sects, philosophic, *see* Schools of philosophers
Sex-life of philosophers, 70, 72, 76, 89, 145, 151, 152, 168, 216. *See also* Marriage of philosophers
Skeptics, 5, 40, 45, 47, 58, 80, 83, 84, 90, 91, 94, 104–6, 108, 120, 123, 128, 134–37, 140–42, 171, 172, 174, 180, 183, 189, 190, 196–200, 204, 206, 218. *See also* Lucian
Slavery, 56, 77, 82, 91, 157
Social life of philosophers, 76, 77, 103, 107, 152–54, 166, 168, 173, 216, 217, 220
Socrates, 12, 74, 76–78, 81, 94–96, 103, 113, 120, 131, 132, 135, 144–46, 148, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 159, 163, 166, 172–77, 184, 187–89, 191, 193–96, 198, 204–6
Socratics, 46, 64, 82, 126, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139
Songs of philosophers, 45, 90, 117, 131
Sopater, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 30, 221
Sosicrates, 46, 48, 54, 69, 71, 76
Sotion, 46, 47, 48, 53, 71, 72, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 85
Soul, doctrines of the, 83, 94, 95, 96, 120, 166, 180, 181, 182, 187, 205, 206, 207, 220. *See also* Religion
Sources of Diogenes Laertius, 35, 37–97, 165, 166, 167, 208–10, 211–14. *See also* Quotations in Diogenes Laertius
Speeches of philosophers, 64, 65, 70, 74, 88, 113, 120, 153, 156, 192, 205. *See also* Rhetoric
Stahr, A., 4, 7, 32

Stanley, H., 2, 33
Statues of philosophers, 79, 108, 118. *See also* Art, Epigrams, Honors bestowed on philosophers, Tombs of philosophers
Stephanus, R., 3, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Stephanus of Byzantium, 7, 9, 30, 48
Stoics, 17, 18, 39–43, 45–47, 50, 51, 55, 63, 65, 71–73, 76–78, 80, 83, 84, 86, 90, 91, 96, 101, 104, 105, 108, 122, 124, 125, 131, 133, 134, 136, 138, 139, 141–43, 150, 157, 158, 171, 175–99, 201, 207, 215, 218, 220. *See also* Chrysippus, Epictetus, Posidonius
Stories concerning philosophers, 31, 43, 44, 53, 54, 62, 70–72, 77, 101, 107, 114, 126–28, 144, 145, 151, 167, 168, 170, 171, 173, 174, 185, 195, 209, 214, 216–19
Strachey, J. St. Loe, 31, 145, 152
Style of philosophers, 43, 63, 82, 122, 130–33, 167, 213, 218. *See also* Writings of philosophers
Successions of philosophers, 46, 47, 48, 53, 58, 69, 71, 108, 133, 134, 136–38, 143. *See also* Pupils, Schools, Teachers, of philosophers
Suidas, 5, 7, 9, 10, 21, 30
Susemihl, F., 40, 41, 51
Synchronisms, in the book of Diogenes Laertius, 68, 69. *See also* Chronology

Taylor, A. E., 6
Teachers of philosophers, 80, 99–103, 106, 116, 117, 136–38, 152, 155, 160, 167, 170, 175, 194, 204, 209, 212, 213. *See also* Education; Pupils, Schools, Successions, of philosophers
Testaments of philosophers, 46, 89, 130, 153
Thales, 34, 63, 65, 69, 73, 75, 81, 96, 111, 118–20, 129, 132, 133, 144, 146, 151, 152, 157, 158, 163, 166, 171, 172, 177, 179, 181–87, 190, 192
Theophrastus 23, 42, 46, 47, 73, 75, 78, 83, 96, 116, 122, 130, 131, 134, 136, 144, 150, 162, 170, 172, 174, 190, 198, 210
Timon, 64, 73, 74–77, 80, 81, 84, 87, 94, 114, 124, 127, 131, 132, 139, 147, 150, 153, 156, 194, 198, 210. *See also* Skeptics
Tombs of philosophers, 109, 117. *See also* Burial, Deaths, of philosophers; Epigrams on philosophers; Statues of philosophers
Travels of philosophers, 77, 96, 110, 129, 158–60, 168. *See also* Places
Trevissoi, M., 5, 6
Trials of philosophers, 56, 62, 65, 70, 72, 78, 88, 161, 162, 168, 185, 192. *See also* Exiles of philosophers
Tyrants, 56, 71, 77, 117, 118, 129, 152, 153, 158, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168, 218, 219
Tzetzes, 7, 9, 10, 30

Ueberweg-Heinze, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, 1, 4, 38, 58, 207

Usener, H., 13, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 29, 37, 47, 48, 49, 56

Voices of philosophers, 62, 76, 148, 216
Volckmann, W., 48
Von der Muehll, F., 13. *See also* Basle edition of Diogenes Laertius
Von der Muehll, P., 14, 17, 27, 29, 30. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius, Manuscripts of the book of Diogenes Laertius

Wachsmuth, C., 13, 15, 16, 18, 27, 29
War, *see* Military achievements of philosophers
Wealth of philosophers, 129, 146, 157, 158, 167, 168, 216. *See also* Poverty of philosophers
Wetstein, H., 24, 25, 26, 28. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von, 8, 37, 43–45, 49, 51, 54, 58, 140
Wise man, views of the ideal, 72, 91, 102, 104, 105, 155, 156, 166, 167, 171, 178, 184, 190, 192, 193, 195, 207, 214, 220. *See also* Sages
Witticisms of philosophers, 74, 82, 173, 174, 216
Women, 100, 152, 205
Writers among philosophers, 43, 92, 106, 118, 128, 135, 189, 192, 195, 210, 213
Writings of philosophers, 40, 43, 53, 56, 62, 63, 65, 72, 80, 81, 88, 91, 93–96, 108, 111, 117, 119, 128, 129, 143, 147–49, 154, 156, 158, 167, 172, 174, 177, 184, 187–89, 192, 195, 197, 204–7, 209, 212, 213, 221

Xenophon, 12, 23, 45, 52, 71, 73, 77, 96, 107, 117, 126, 132, 137, 145, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154, 158, 195, 205

Yonge, C. D., 1, 27. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius
Youth, 56, 75, 149, 158, 182

Zeller, E., 5, 34, 109
Zevort, M., 7, 25, 31, 32, 140, 141. *See also* Editions of Diogenes Laertius

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

FOREIGN AGENT
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN HOUSE, LONDON, E.C.

MILLS COLLEGE LIBRARY

THIS BOOK DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

Books not returned on time are subject to a fine of 10c per volume per day.

DEC 6 1947

NOV 8 1948

JAN 8 '57

JAN 22 '57

MAY 25 '59

FACULTY

MAY 18 1988

54806

MILLS COLLEGE LIBRARY

BNF 183.4 D591Xh
The book of Diogenes Laertius; its Hope, Richard, 1895-

3 3086 00061 7720

Mills College Library
Withdrawn

183.4 54806 D591Xh